DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 473 HE 014 941

TITLE	Planning and Evaluation Information in the Office of Student Affairs: Review and Recommendations. A Report of the OSA Task Force on Research and Planning Information.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Office for Student Affairs.
PUB DATE	15 Sep 81
NOTE	96p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office for Student Affairs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
JOURNAL CIT	OSA Research Bulletin; v22 n3 Sep 15 1981
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Administrators; *Agency Role; *College Planning; Educational Quality; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Information Needs; Institutional Research; Management Information Systems; Needs Assessment; Program Costs; *Program Evaluation; Research Methodology; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Types of planning and evaluation information already being gathered by the Office for Student Affairs (OSA), University of Minnesota, and recommendations for new efforts in the measurement of the volume of OSA's activities, the costs of OSA services/functions, and quality of OSA programs are examined. It is suggested that planning information in the OSA has not been consistent and systematic. Most of the planning and evaluation done in student affairs offices have been specific to particular units, often in response to ad hoc requests for information. It is suggested that OSA will be increasingly required to document the quantity, quality, and cost effectiveness of its services, and therefore will have to develop information systems that will consistently permit prompt but detailed response to information requests. In addition, planning information systems must not be so cumbersome or costly that they drain too much money or staff time from the actual delivery of services. A system for quantitatively describing the volume of activities and associating costs with these activities is proposed. The system requires a consistent reporting format and description of inputs (costs and staffing), while leaving units some choice in their selection of quantitative activity indicators. It is recommended that OSA units choose at least one technique derived from three major approaches to quality and impact assessment: management approach, self-study approach, and student outcomes approaches. Appendices include: an inventory of OSA planning and evaluation reports, and information on the state-of-the art of evaluation efforts in selected public service agencies and guidelines for peer review. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OSA Research Bulletin
Office for Student Affairs
University of Minnesota
Volume 22
Number 3
Date 9-15-81

OSA

ED214473

PLANNING AND EVALUATION INFORMATION IN THE OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS: REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A REPORT OF THE OSA TASK FORCE ON RESEARCH AND PLANNING INFORMATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

University of Minnesota

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 04941

Planning and Evaluation Information in the Office of Student Affairs: A Review and Recommendations

A Report of the Task Force on Research and Planning Information
Office of Student Affairs
University of Minnesota

9/15/81

E. Gary Joselyn, Chair
Roberta Armstrong
Robert Barnett
Tim Delmont
Bonita Janda
Ron Matross
Dallis Perry

Table of Contents

		Page
Foreword		
Executive Summary		1
Introduction		1
Chapter One:	An analysis of current OSA planning and evaluation data	5
Chapter Two:	Assessing the work of OSA services and determining costs	13
Chapter Three:	Appraising the quality and impact of OSA services	21
Chapter Four:	Concluding Comments	38
Appendix A:	An inventory of OSA planning and evaluation reports	
Appendix B:	Planning information report: Instructions and background information	
Appendix C:	The "state of the art" of evaluation efforts in selected public service agencies	
Appendix D:	A selected review of the literature on evaluation in Student Affairs	
Appendix E:	Examples of level of service analyses for OSA units	
Appendix F:	Sample guidelines for peer review of student health and student financial aid office	

Foreword

On September, 1979, I was invited to attend the OSA Coordinators retreat at the Freshwater Research Institute in Orono. I was invited because I had just been appointed Chairperson of the new OSA Task Force on Research and Planning Information Needs. Almost exactly two years later the final report of the Task Force was presented at the OSA Coordinators meeting in September, 1981. Typically, and perhaps fortunately, the Task Force was not aware, two years ago, of the enormity of the task ahead. For the first year we met at least once every two weeks, with once-a-week meetings the second year, summers included.

There were four phases to our efforts:

1. Deciding, with central administration, what it was, exactly, we were to do. In retrospect this may have been the most difficult and most time consuming phase.
2. Investigating and reporting on the present status of information gathering, reporting, and evaluation efforts within the various OSA units.
3. Deciding upon recommendations for assembling quantitative information.
4. Deciding upon recommendations for gathering quality and impact information.

Membership attrition during the first year reduced our membership to four stalwart members: Roberta Armstrong, Bonnie Janda, Dallis Perry and Gary Joselyn.

We received outstanding professional help throughout from staff persons Tim Delmont and Ron Matross, and from Forrest Moore the first year and Bob Barnett the second year. It is an understatement to say that this report would not exist without their competent and tireless efforts.

Forrest and Bob, in addition to being contributing committee members, served as liaison with the Vice-President's office, helping us to keep our "eye on the ball" and alerting us to issues of concern to OSA central decision-makers. Tim visited and interviewed evaluators of social service and public agencies and prepared the first drafts of Chapter 2 and parts of Chapter 3. Ron did the literature search (assisted by Bob) and prepared the first drafts (and countless re-writes) of the bulk of the manuscript. To him goes the title of "principal author." Even more valuable perhaps, than their research and writing skills was the innovative and creative thinking they all brought to our deliberations.

Throughout, we have striven to provide OSA with a report which will be practical and useful, one which will help OSA improve and make more efficient its services to students and one which will help OSA to communicate about the extent and effectiveness of its contribution to the University to higher-level decision-makers, both within and outside the University. Time will now reveal the extent to which we have been successful.

-- Gary Joselyn

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the direction of the Vice President for Student Affairs Frank B. Wilderson, Jr. an OSA Task Force on Research and Planning Information was appointed to examine the state of planning and evaluation information in the Office of Student Affairs and to make recommendations about future OSA efforts in this area. The task force developed a model for its enquiry, reviewed available OSA planning documents, interviewed OSA coordinators, reviewed the literature on evaluation in student affairs, and interviewed persons in the community with experience in evaluating social service programs. Based on these efforts the task force developed recommendations for tracking the volume of OSA services and their costs and assessing the quality and impact of OSA services. The key conclusions and recommendations of the task force are summarized below.

Conclusions

Conclusion One: Planning information in the Office of Student Affairs has not been consistent and systematic.

Most of the planning and evaluation data in student affairs offices have been specific to particular units, often in response to ad hoc requests for information. OSA has had little consistency in the types of information it has collected for planning purposes or the formats for presenting the information. OSA departments' studies have been strongest in the areas of satisfaction surveys and descriptions of programs and clients. They have paid relatively less attention to quantitatively describing the volume of service and the costs associated with these services and assessing the quality and impact of services.

Conclusion Two: OSA will need improved planning information in the future.

The climate of the times, both in the institution and outside of it, indicates that OSA will be increasingly required to document the quantity, quality, and cost/effectiveness of its services. Funding for higher education is likely to diminish or remain static. Scrutiny of all tax-supported institutions is likely to become more intense and more sophisticated. OSA will have to develop information systems which will consistently permit prompt but detailed responses to information requests. Specifically, OSA should give high priority to developing a system for quantifying its inputs (funding, staff) and outputs (activities, services) so that costs per unit of

activity can be determined. The University's evolving planning system virtually necessitates this type of information. Sensible planning also requires consideration of information about the quality of services and their impact on their clientele. OSA needs to develop information systems in these areas, too. Not having planning information systems will handicap OSA in the increasingly severe competition for resources. More positively, such systems can improve planning and ultimately the delivery of services at the unit level.

Conclusion Three: Future OSA planning information systems must be practical and cost effective.

When interviewed, both persons experienced in evaluation of human services and OSA coordinators stressed the need to apply the same standards of cost effectiveness to information systems as are applied to services themselves. Planning information systems must not be so cumbersome or costly that they drain too much money or staff time from the actual delivery of services. A balance must be struck between quality and utility of information and its cost.

Recommendations

Recommendation One: OSA should implement a system for quantitatively describing the volume of its activities and associating costs with these activities.

We have developed a fairly detailed proposal for such a management information system. Its specifications include options for quantitative indicators of activity, methods for assigning costs to units of activity, and a reporting form and guidelines for assembling input and output information. The proposed system attempts to balance the need for consistency across units with the need to reflect their unique operations. It does so by requiring a consistent reporting format and description of inputs (costs and staffing) while leaving units some latitude in their selection of quantitative activity indicators. We offer the proposed system with the understanding that it would be open to modification on the basis of experience with it.

Recommendation Two: OSA units should implement at least one technique for assessing the quality and impact of their services.

Our literature review and conversations with other student affairs divisions and providers of human services revealed several diverse approaches to the assessment of quality and impact. We chose not to recommend a single system but rather to recommend that OSA units choose at least one technique derived from three major approaches to quality and impact assessment.

From the management approach to quality assessment, we suggest that OSA look at the possibility of describing quality of service in terms of level of service. This would involve describing quality with indices such as intensity of service, length of time taken to deliver a service, and the number and scope of services provided. While not yet well developed, the level of service concept is receiving considerable attention as a planning tool at this university because of its compatibility with program directors' thinking about planning decisions.

A second approach to the assessment of quality is the self-study approach. From this perspective, we were impressed with the review team technique, in which periodic reviews of services are conducted by individuals brought together for this purpose. This approach has the advantage of being both cost effective and highly compatible with the norms and traditions of higher education. The University of California system has developed a detailed approach to the use of review teams in support units, including those in student affairs. We suggest that the California system is one worth considering (with appropriate modifications) for use in OSA.

Both the management and self-study approaches deal primarily with issues of quality. To deal with issues of the impact of student services student outcome approaches are needed. Student affairs programs have their main impacts in the areas of enhancing student development and helping students succeed in the academic environment. The appraisal of student development is currently receiving much attention in the student affairs literature, although it has yet had little applicability to day-to-day decision making in student affairs. This approach stresses the need to assess impact in terms of measured changes in the persons served by programs. While we were not able to suggest a particular system for measuring developmental outcomes, we do encourage the exploration of several developmental techniques as possible sources of impact indices, the most likely being techniques of competency assessment. We also believe that the University should pay increased systematic attention to measuring more pragmatically defined outcome variables of student success, particularly graduation and attrition rates. Some OSA programs are legitimately evaluated partially in terms of whether they help students appropriately complete their studies.

We also wish to draw attention to a useful technique which can substitute for more rigorous methods of measuring quality and impact. This technique is the systematic use of surveys. Surveys of student needs and satisfaction

with services have been the most popular evaluation techniques in the Office of Student Affairs and at student affairs divisions in other universities. Despite their subjectivity, surveys provide useful information at relatively low cost. We suggest that OSA consider establishing a systematic plan for periodically surveying the service needs of its various constituencies and their satisfaction with OSA services. Such surveys should use a consistent schedule and methodology so that they permit comparisons across time and across units.

Planning and Evaluation Information in the Office of Student Affairs: A Review and Recommendations

INTRODUCTION

In an era of static or diminishing resources in higher education, planning is an increasingly important activity. Besides good judgment, effective planning requires good information. For this reason, in the fall of 1979 the Vice President for Student Affairs, Frank B. Wilderson, Jr., commissioned a task force to evaluate the state of planning information in the Office of Student Affairs and to make recommendations about what information should be developed in the future.

This is the final report of that task force. Included in it are an assessment of the types of planning information already being gathered in OSA and recommendations for new efforts in the measurement of the volume of activities in OSA, the costs of OSA services and functions, and quality of OSA programs.

A Capsule History of the Task Force

Phase I: Development of an Enquiry Model

The first step in the Task Force's efforts was to focus and organize its enquiry. For this purpose we developed an enquiry model--a fourfold classification of the content of planning and evaluation information. The areas are defined as follows:

Program Descriptions	Descriptions of programs/functions/activities; purposes/goals/objectives of programs and services; input (staffing, funding/facilities).
Clientele Descriptions	Descriptions of persons for whom service/program is intended; characteristics of user/non-users; reports of assessments of the needs of intended clientele.
Output Measures	Measures of the amount and type of work produced, such as number of persons served, problems considered, reports produced.
Quality/Impact Indicants	Quantitative and qualitative indicants of the effects of services and programs, such as client satisfaction, developmental changes in students, usage of reports.

This model served us well in allowing us to make comparisons across OSA units, to analyze the literature on planning and evaluation in student affairs, and to organize our thinking about OSA's information needs. Much of the remainder of this report is organized around the enquiry model.

Phase 2: Study of Planning Information in OSA and Elsewhere

After developing the enquiry model, the task force used it to catalogue and analyze the existing planning and evaluation reports in OSA. This was done by reading available reports and interviewing the OSA coordinators. From this research we gained a sense of the strong and weak points of OSA's present planning information.

The next step in our work was to examine the evaluation and planning approaches described in the student affairs literature, student affairs divisions at other universities, and in social service agencies in the Twin Cities area. We looked at the work in this area at other student affairs units because these were clearly relevant to our task. We sought out the information from the social service agencies because it offered the opportunity to give us some insights into the evaluation enterprise beyond what could be gleaned from the literature. The Twin Cities area has a number of agencies such as the United Way and the Hennepin County Mental Health Center which have been involved in developing planning and evaluation information for several years. We interviewed several persons in these agencies in the hope that their personal insights into their successes and failures would be instructive to us in designing information systems for OSA. Summaries of both our review of the student affairs literature and our conversations with social service agencies are appended.

Phase 3: Development of Recommendations

The final phase of our work was to develop recommendations for future OSA planning and evaluation information. We concluded that there are needs for new efforts both in the areas of quantitative description of the OSA programs and the output of these programs, and in the assessments of the quality and impact of OSA programs. Undergirding our proposals were several assumptions about the nature of planning in the next decade. These are described below:

The 1980's: A Decade of Planning for Limited Resources. We began our efforts to develop recommendations by considering the reporting requirements likely to be imposed on OSA from within the University. We did so because the OSA coordinators told us that they treat these requirements as the most

pressing and of the highest priority. Whatever information is requested for the University planning cycle, particularly its biennial requests, will necessarily be the most important (with the exception of some federal and state reporting requirements). Many other types of information may be desirable and useful, but that which meets requests will be the most compelling. We, as a task force, concluded that the best thing we could accomplish would be to help develop information systems for meeting these reporting requirements.

In the past OSA has relied primarily on quickly-constructed, ad hoc replies to requests for planning and evaluation information. This approach has worked rather well because these requests have been fairly few, quality requirements minimal, and costs modest.

Unfortunately, the ad hoc approach is likely to be inadequate to meet the reporting requirements of the mid and latter 1980's. Data requests from within and without the University are likely to be more frequent and complex than they were before. At all levels of government in the early 1980's, fiscal restraint and accountability are watchwords. Tax-supported programs, including those of public universities, have to be able to furnish data to show that they are spending the taxpayers' money wisely. Quantitative reporting requirements are increasingly likely to be a part of federal and state budget allocations. Our conversations with student affairs staff members at other universities confirmed this observation. In particular, the Pennsylvania State University system has developed a system in its student affairs division for developing cost and volume information, primarily because it has encountered such reporting requirements.

Moreover, as they gain experience with quantitative planning, planners and decision-makers are becoming more sophisticated in their attention to methodological detail. The University of Minnesota is using more detailed and more quantitative information in its planning that it ever has before. OSA will be handicapped if it enters the planning process with data that are weaker or less complete than those of other parts of the University.

All of this argues for what Gary Hanson, Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs at the University of Texas, calls "anticipatory data gathering." In our judgment, OSA must develop systems for anticipating data requests before they come. The advantages of anticipatory systems are that they allow requests to be met more quickly, accurately, and completely than do ad hoc responses. If one has had time to think through the issues, develop methods, and set up collection systems in advance, then one is much more likely to provide good data when they're needed.

Additionally, good anticipatory data can be used for planning at the unit level. While we have emphasized the need to meet external requests imposed on units, planning information can also be used to provide better service on a day to day basis. Good management data can help unit directors decide how to allocate resources within their units and whether further programs are needed. The University Legal Service is a case in point. Through the collection of data on client load and the time and expense involved with types of clients, the Legal Service has been able to better decide how to allocate staff time to various types of cases. Follow-up data on clients has also been useful in assessing the quality of legal service with various kinds of cases. Our impression is that the Legal Service data has been important both in making a case for the program centrally and in managing its affairs internally. Well-designed planning information systems are tools for creativity and innovation in management, and are more than just necessary evils imposed from outside.

Of course, anticipatory research is worthwhile only when it anticipates the right things. A system that develops answers to the wrong questions is worse than having none at all. Additionally, information systems must not be too burdensome. Information systems can easily become so cumbersome and complex that any gains from them are far outweighed by the pain and effort of gathering the information required. (Veterans of OSA's previous excursions into MBO and PPBS are forcefully reminded of this hazard.) On balance, however, we are convinced that the need for anticipatory planning systems is strong enough that OSA should experiment with them. Thus the recommendations of the task force concern the development of anticipatory planning information systems for describing the quantity and quality of OSA services.

Structure of the Report

Chapter One of the report analyzes the current state of OSA planning information in terms of the enquiry model. Chapter Two describes and recommends a system for quantifying the volume of activity in OSA and associating costs with units of activity. The proposed system is intended to integrate elements of program description, clientele description, and output measurement into a unitary management information system. Chapter Three considers the appraisal of the quality and impact of OSA services and offers recommendations on appraisal techniques. Also included are appendices detailing available OSA planning reports, reporting on interviews with personnel in Twin Cities social service agencies, surveying the literature on evaluation in student affairs, and detailing aspects of our proposals for systems to assess program inputs, outputs, and quality.

CHAPTER ONE

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT OSA PLANNING AND EVALUATION DATA

The first undertaking of the task force was to survey and analyze the planning and evaluation data currently developed in OSA. This was done through the review of documents and interviews with OSA coordinators in the spring of 1980. The interviewers asked about the methods by which planning and evaluation information is generated, the uses to which it is put, and the coordinators' perceptions of issues and problems associated with the production of such information.

The analysis is very much a "broad brush" overview of the data available. While we did look at annual reports and studies given to us by the coordinators, we did not conduct further interviews, nor did we attempt to catalog and analyze all the different types of reports and information available. Our purpose was to gain a general sense of what is being done and why, not to do a detailed inventory and analysis of individual documents. Undoubtedly we did not mention or even see all the documents which are relevant to this report. This is especially the case for the larger offices in OSA, particularly Admissions and Records, which has many subunits each of which has ways of keeping track of its output.

The chapter consists of a narrative summary of the findings and analyses of the task force for each of the data categories in our enquiry model, and some general comments about the current state of information gathering in OSA and issues surrounding these efforts. A listing of the reports issued by each area in each of the data categories is included as Appendix A.

Program Descriptions

Purposes

Program descriptions tend to be oriented toward two distinct audiences, and thus are of two distinct types. One type of description is prepared for clients and other service consumers. This type is primarily narrative and focuses on the benefits and services offered by various OSA units. The second type of description is intended for planning by the central office and the rest of the university administration. This latter report usually reports some financial information and is provided on an annual or biennial basis. Not every unit has regularly produced an annual report, and it is not clear what happens to the reports that are made. The reports for the biennial request, however, have been completed for a clear purpose.

Financial Information

The units vary considerably in the frequency and specificity with which they describe the costs of their programs. In general, those operations which charge clients for services or receive revenue from student fees tend to be more specific and detailed in describing costs than do units primarily funded by legislative funds. The Housing Office provides detailed financial data in much of its reporting, simply because it is an $11 million business. It must have a cost accounting system like any other business. To a lesser extent, the Student Organization Finance Division and the Health Service use similar cost accounting procedures because of their similarity to business enterprises. For other units, financial reporting is less of a concern. It tends to happen when it is asked for by the central administration. All units provide roughly comparable information for the preparation of the University's biennial request to the Legislature. This information is organized in a line budget (e.g., cost of academic staff, civil service staff, etc., supplies and expenses, etc.).

For most units, financial information is seldom broken down by program. One exception to this generalization is the Unions, which maintain a program budget reporting system (PPBS). Attempts are made to assign costs to individual Union programs. Although not using a PPBS system, Boynton Health Service and the University Student Legal Service also are able to cost out programs to a certain extent. It should be noted that these offices are supported by student fees, and are often called on to provide more detailed financial information than those which are supported by legislative funds solvely.

Goals and Objectives

In preparation for the last biennial request coordinators prepared statements of mission, goals and objectives for each of their offices. These will be revised biannually. Most offices do not extend this type of effort to the work of individual staff. The Management by Objectives system (MBO), tried some years ago, never gained lasting acceptance. The Unions remain one exception. The Unions continue to use both a management by objectives and a program budgeting system, and in fact are working on integrating the two systems (so that costs could be assigned to the attainment of objectives). The coordinators of Housing and Student Activities also have unit directors compile statements of objectives.

Staff Input (Time Tallies, Workload Measures)

Several units require staff to keep time and/or activity tallies. These take the form either of counts of persons seen (also used as an output measure),

or of tabulating time spent (e.g., listing activities in 15 minute blocks). Again, the more closely the unit resembles a business, the more likely it is to use such a system. The Student Legal Service uses a rather detailed computerized system which allows it to make some inferences about such things as whether certain types of cases take inordinate amounts of staff time. The Student Counseling Bureau and the Health Service also utilize a fairly formal system like this, as do parts of Admissions and Records. Other units such as OMSSA and ISAO have less formal time tally systems whose uses are less clear. Professional staff find this sort of thing aversive. Those units which have successfully maintained it have had clear uses for it. In other cases where the uses are less clear, staff tend not to take it too seriously.

Clientele Descriptions

Who Uses OSA Services

Most OSA services that serve students maintain some data on the demography of the persons they serve (e.g., class, college, sex). The Health Service, OMSSA, and all of the units in the Student Development Centers, SCB, ISAO, Minnesota Women's Center, can provide information of this type in varying amounts and types. Those in the Student Activities area can also furnish some information of this sort, including data from the Student Legal Service on its clients, traffic surveys of Union users, descriptions of Union workshop attenders, and users of Recreational Sports. Housing, too, can describe the background characteristics of residents of University housing, as can the Health Service.

Who Does Not Use OSA Services?

The obverse of the question of who uses a service is who does not use a service. This question is important because it can tell one about underserved and potentially needy populations. OSA offices have considerably less information about whom they do not serve than whom they do serve. Only a few offices can provide such information, primarily through the student activity card requested of students at registration and through the fees surveys conducted by Student Life Studies for the Fees Committee. Recreational Sports and Boynton Health Service have been able to learn some things about non-users through the registration card survey. This information was supplemented in the 1979 fees survey, which obtained similar information with regard to these services, as well as information about how many students, and for what reasons, seek health care outside the University.

The fees survey also looked at how many persons were aware of the Student Legal Service, and how many used it and non-University legal services. The survey suggested that awareness and use were definitely lower among one population, St. Paul campus students. One other report of this type is the Housing Office study of where students live. This report allows comparisons between persons living in University housing and those who live elsewhere. In general, however, the efforts in comparing users and non-users of OSA services have been piecemeal and rather unsystematic.

Studies of Client and Non-client Needs

One can go beyond simple descriptions of the background characteristics of clients to more dynamic descriptions of their needs. One way of understanding client needs is to classify their presenting problems on intake. The Counseling Bureau, Health Service and Student Legal Service do this. They are able to talk about which types of clients present which types of problems. Another way of understanding needs is to infer them from activity participation. Recreational Sports and the Unions use this simple and sensible model to a considerable extent. If a particular activity (e.g., aerobic dance) seems popular when it is first presented, then the activity will be presented more often until it meets the demand.

However, neither of these approaches will necessarily identify unmet needs among persons currently not being served. More general studies of student needs have been infrequent. The Unions are a notable exception, having conducted a general study of this type in 1978. Data from this study has been used for planning in the activity area, but the information has not been widely circulated. Another exception was a study of student legal needs conducted before the initiation of the Student Legal Service. Overall, however, formal needs assessments are not routinely conducted in OSA.

Output Measures

Frequency

The frequency with which counts are taken varies considerably from daily to annually. Revenue generating offices tend to keep the more frequent records (e.g., the Housing Office keeps a daily count of beds occupied [paid for]). Others keeping fairly frequent records are those that handle a volume of interactions, such as parts of Admissions and Records. Those which produce less frequent but larger things such as reports tend to keep data on a longer time line, usually annually. The situation on frequency is complicated

somewhat by the fact that the frequency of reporting the data does not usually equal the frequency with which it is compiled. Data may be compiled by staff on a daily basis and summarized in an annual report. In general, the concept of random sampling has not been used extensively. Those who keep detailed figures tend to do so on a total output basis. Whether or not sampling could accomplish the same purpose with less effort is a question that should be addressed.

Purpose

Two main purposes for output information can be distinguished: Meeting reporting requirements, and unit-based management. Some data appear to be compiled primarily to meet an external reporting requirement, and appear only in annual reports. Individual staff keep track of their activities and hear little or nothing about the use of the information. Others do try to use the data for planning purposes. In the Health Service, the Student Legal Service, and Admissions and Records, the data go to immediate supervisors or unit managers. To an extent which is hard to pinpoint, the data in these areas are used for planning the types of services to be offered. In other cases the only time the data seem to be used is in annual reports summarizing activities. The uses to which the data are put in these cases by higher level administrators is not clear. We do not know to what extent various annual summaries of services rendered, headcounts, etc. as they are currently collected, are useful to central administrators in the university. It does appear, however, that those services supported by student fees keep more detailed output figures than do other services, probably because they are required to do so.

Financial Outcomes

Very seldom are output measures related to costs (i.e., there are few or no systems of cost accounting in OSA which relate amount of input to output in such a way that costs can be assigned to units of the output measure). The Student Legal Service, Coffman Union, the Health Service, and to some extent the Housing Office come closest to being able to provide this type of cost accounting information. Each of these services receives revenue for services and has fairly rigorous reporting requirements. They are able to make some inferences about which types of services cost them the most money. Outside of these units, costs in OSA are generally not related to outcomes even with the more elaborate counting system used in some Admissions and Records units.

Quality/Impact Indicants

Of all the types of planning and evaluation data one might collect, indicants of quality and impact are the most complicated, expensive, and difficult to construct. Clearly, any given service is likely to have multiple effects on different groups, some important and some trivial. Which effects should be measured, how they should be measured, and for what purposes are questions that should be raised whenever impact is considered. Given the complexity of the matter, it should be no surprise that most OSA offices have not gone very far in assessing impacts.

Satisfaction Assessments

The easiest and least expensive way to address the question of whether or not an office is doing a good job is by measuring client satisfaction. Most OSA offices have at one time or another conducted a satisfaction study among their clients. A few do such studies routinely. Those with regular assessments of client satisfaction include the Counseling Bureau, Student Legal Service, and the Health Service. Others, such as Recreational Sports, the Unions, the Women's Center, and Off-campus Housing, have done occasional satisfaction studies.

Satisfaction studies are probably popular among directors and coordinators because they are cost-effective for the purposes for which they are used. The primary purpose to which they are put seems to be summative evaluation (i.e., justifying the existence of an office, or making a case for an increase in appropriations). This has been the case particularly with fee-supported services, which have been asked to make cases for requested increases or for staving off threatened decreases. Our sense is that such data have seldom been used for formative evaluation purposes, such as redesigning programs or redistributing resources. In several cases, the staff who provide services do not usually see or discuss the reports of satisfaction data gathered by the office.

Measured Impact

From a scholarly point of view, satisfaction studies are a necessary but not sufficient way of assessing impact. Clients can be satisfied with services which later turn out to be of little use or of low quality. Changes in behavior are not implied by satisfaction, nor are side effects considered. Ultimate tests of whether a service makes a difference involve questions of changes in persons and changes in environments. For example, did counseling improve the adjustment of students to college? Are students in support

programs more likely to graduate then students who are not in such programs? Are students healthier and more active as a result of a health service? Does participation in student activities make a difference in terms of student success in school and in life? Do students gain educationally from participation in extra curricula? These are the sorts of "meaty" questions which can't be answered from satisfaction studies. These are also questions which have not been addressed by OSA offices (with some noteworthy historical exceptions, particularly the Volsky et al and Campbell studies of the impact of counseling). In the recent past, no OSA office has addressed the issue of impact in anything like a full-scale program evaluation study. Satisfaction has served as a "stand in" for the more difficult assessment of the impact of services.

The coordinators were quite candid about their reasons for not undertaking more substantive impact studies. Essentially they have had no reason to do so. Everyone agreed that such studies are important and a good thing, but they questioned whether or not large expenditures on them were justified at a time when their resources for providing services (as opposed to assessing services) are becoming more and more limited. So long as impact studies are not demanded as a condition for survival, they are not seen as cost-effective when compared to alternatives for spending money on services themselves. However, one idea which did come out of the interviews was that various offices might pool their resources in doing occasional fairly general impact studies, conducted by Student Life Studies or a similar centralized office. There was concern that OSA may be asked to provide more definitive impact data in the future, and a pooled, centralized effort might be an effective way to accomplish this.

General Comments and Issues

The broadest possible characterization of the research and planning information currently available in OSA is that the information is relatively strong in the areas describing programs and sometimes in counting output, but relatively weak in the "tougher" areas of program evaluation, and the association of inputs (costs) with outputs (activities). Understanding the nature of clients and non-clients and the effects programs have on them has not been a routine, systematic priority in most OSA offices. Some excellent examples of studies in these areas, most notably satisfaction studies, have been done, but they have not been coordinated and consistent across the units.

Assuming that there are good reasons for additional planning information, there are a number of questions about the shape of further information efforts in this area. These include:

Consistency. To what extent should there be consistency across OSA offices in the information developed? Should very diverse offices try to measure similar things in similar ways, or should each tailor its enquiries completely to its own situations? Can key indicators be developed to describe activities across all units. Should report formats be consistent?

Audience. For whom should data be gathered, and for what purposes? Can the same systems address both the needs for summative evaluations by central staff and formative evaluations by program staff? What kinds of information will be mandated by internal and external reporting requirements?

Frequency: How often does information need to be collected? Can systems of repeated studies be established so that trends can be studied?

Cost/Effectiveness. What kinds of planning and evaluation data will yield the most information with the least cost? Are cost accounting data needed? Are studies of impact and quality needed?

Centralization. To what extent should planning and evaluation studies be centralized? Should they be done by individual offices, or should they be conducted or coordinated by an OSA central office?

These issues, among others, are at the heart of designs for information systems. In the following chapters we have taken stands on many of these issues as part of our analyses and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

ASSESSING THE WORK OF OSA SERVICES AND DETERMINING COSTS

Having surveyed the planning and evaluation efforts currently underway in OSA, the task force turned its attention to the difficult question of what kinds of information OSA should develop in the future and how they should be collected. This chapter describes our first recommendation on these issues: the development of a modest quantitatively-based management information system for OSA.

University of Minnesota Institutional Planning and Budgeting Systems

Task force members reviewed the University's newly developed planning and budgeting systems to assess their processes, data types, and reporting requirements. Anticipating a decline in student enrollment and fiscal contraction in the 1980's, the University's executive officers have developed a comprehensive planning system which appears to have:

- -- identified institutional program and funding priorities;
- -- linked institutional planning and short term budgeting decisions;
- -- ensured resource flexibility through a retrenchment and reallocation mechanism;
- -- responded to increasing demands for information and accountability in decision-making from internal constituents and state authorities.

In creating and implementing these initiatives institutional line and staff officers have identified and captured assorted quantitative and qualitative data about institutional and unit objectives, strategies, priorities, and outputs. Special attention has been given to comparative and time series data, mostly quantitative in nature. Selected examples follow:

- -- program expenditure data, activity descriptors, and performance indicators supporting biennial requests to state authorities;
- -- financial and personnel data for preparation of the annual budget, (e.g., instructional workload, unit cost, and position count data);
- -- student/faculty ratios, average and marginal unit costs, and volume measures used in preparing planned resource projections for collegiate units;
- -- funding, faculty and student data collected in a comprehensive planning data base and displayed in the Basic Data Reference publication.

In the past two years a trend has been clearly established: funding, staffing, performance, and cost data have been perceived as essential to planning, budgeting, and management decision making at the highest administrative levels of the University. Moreover, the University's Planning Council, a major planning group reporting to the President, has recently endorsed a methodology for assessing resource needs in service and support units based on trends in volume indicators and program costs. While the emphasis in the preparation and uses of planning data will change as information needs and decision contexts vary, the direction of future efforts seems quite apparent to us. OSA will increasingly be called upon to describe in quantitative terms the volume of its work, the costs associated with that work, and ultimately the quality of its work.

In the rest of this chapter we describe a preliminary design for a funding and output data system, a way of systematically quantifying the volume of OSA services and assigning costs to them. In Chapter Three we then describe proposed approaches for appraising the quality of OSA services.

A Proposal for a Modest Management Information System in OSA

An ideal system for quantitatively describing activities and costs is one that is extremely simple and consistent across units, while at the same time capturing the uniqueness and complexity of OSA services. Unfortunately, these two design specifications appear to be trade-offs. To gain simplicity and comparability, one must sacrifice some richness and uniqueness.

Our approach to dealing with the problem of compromising ideal specifications for an information system was to sketch the outlines of a possible system with enough flexibility in it so that the final balance between complexity and simplicity could be evolved in practice.

The logic of the system is relatively straightforward. For each function or unit in OSA, one compiles personnel and funding data (inputs), quantitative indicators of activities (outputs), and then divides so that costs per unit are computed. Each part of the system is described in the following pages. A copy of the Planning Information Report, the proposed survey form for capturing these OSA data, is displayed on pages 19 and 20. Detailed instructions and background materials about this report may be found in the "Planning Information Report: Instructions and Background Information" in Appendix B.

What to Describe: Functions or Departments. One of the fundamental decisions in developing planning information is whether breakdowns should be

by departments or by functions. There are several advantages to developing a functional breakdown. Any given department usually has several functions, some of which may be more important (and costly) than others. Functional breakdowns may allow more finely-tuned decisions about priorities within departments. Functional breakdowns facilitate comparisons among different departments performing similar activities (e.g. counseling). Functional breakdowns also facilitate comparisons with other universities, where student affairs departmental organizations may be different.

On the other hand, functional breakdowns have the disadvantage of making it more difficult to assign costs. Budgets are kept along departmental lines. To assign costs to functions, one often must reorganize cost information. Secondly, obtaining consensus on functions is often difficult. A very short list of functions eases data compilation, but may sacrifice some of the uniqueness of each program. Finding a workable number of functions is not easy. A list of functions initially developed by OSA coordinators is also included in Appendix B. It represents one attempt to do a functional breakdown.

Input Data: Financial and Personnel Information. Having selected a functional breakdown, the next step in the system is to compile funding and personnel information about each function or service. Since the University has different sources of money (e.g., legislative appropriations, student fees, external grants), it is useful to record how much money is devoted to a function from each source and for what ongoing general purpose, i.e., staff salaries, fringe benefits, and supplies, expense, and equipment. Another decision to be made in assembling input data is whether to use budget data (proposed funds) or expenditure data (funds actually spent). Expenditure data are preferable because they more accurately reflect real costs, but budgeted data may be easier to compile.

Output Data: Activity Indicators. The third element in the system is a way of quantitatively describing the volume or extent of a service. Collegiate units typically emphasize the use of a uniform, reliably defined activity indicator: the student credit hour. However, because of the diversity and range of OSA services, no single output or activity measure is apparent. Thus we think that OSA might initially consider using several activity indicators or volume measures in our information system.

The task force chose to define a list of possible indicators for OSA services, assuming that coordinators and directors would decide which ones are the most appropriate. These indicators are listed and defined as follows:

Activity Indicator Definitions

Participants (Identified/Nonduplicated)
Number of individuals (people whom you can identify) who have used a service or have participated in an activity (e.g., workshop, dances). Each person is counted only once, regardless of how many times they participated in the activity.

Participants (Duplicated/Not Identified)
Number of persons who participated in an activity or received a service, with no attempt to identify them. A person gets counted once each time he or she participates.

Usages
The total number of participations or usages of a facility regardless of the number of individuals involved.

Personal Contacts--Brief
Most providers of service spend part of their time answering short questions and having very brief consultations in person or by telephone. The nature of these contacts seems different from more intensive contacts such as consultations or counseling interviews. We think that brief personal contacts typically last from 1-15 minutes while intensive contacts last longer that that. However, we will leave it to each service to precisely define a brief contact.

Personal Consultations/Interviews (Intensive)
Intensive personal interactions involving delivery of professional services to clients (e.g. counseling, attorney and physician interviews)--typically lasting longer than 15 minutes).

Transactions
Number of things or pieces of data processed (e.g. financial transactions, records entered, documents processed, requests answered by mail).

Events
Number of activities, events put on or offered (e.g. workshops, non-credit courses, dances, etc.).

Reports Completed
Numbers of countable formal reports written or prepared (e.g. reported investigations, research studies), position papers, committee reports, policy statements.

Services Provided
Number of definable, discrete services offered (e.g. medical procedures or test procedures).

Hours Spent
Hours spent seem like appropriate measures only when it is impossible to count other outputs. We think that this occurs primarily for administrative and project-oriented activities and is best determined by estimation of proportions of time spent, rather than ongoing time tallies.

Client Development Unit

A measure of contact and time spent per individual served. A weighted sum of all the activities involved in direct service to clients (e.g. counseling, consultation, group work).

Organizational Support: Committees/Panels

Number of panels, committees one participates in.

Courses Taught/Credit Hours

Number of courses taught and/or number of credits in those courses.

Lectures/Presentations

Number of lectures and presentations given by an office or individual.

Unit Cost Data. The fourth element in the system is the computation of costs per unit of activity or service. Such data are typically helpful in assessing the implications of funding trends, changes in service needs, or anticipated resource requirements. In the Planning Information Report, we suggest that at least three examples of unit costs be computed for each OSA function to assess cost variations among OSA services.

We assume that unit cost data will be helpful to both OSA coordinators and the VPSA in planning and budget decision making. They also likely represent the most basic type of data useful in information exchanges with other institutions. We caution, however, that these data must be interpreted carefully so that the average unit costs of providing a service will be distinguished, if necessary, from the marginal costs of doing so (marginal being the cost of adding or subtracting a unit of service from established service levels).

Reporting. Once cost and activity information are compiled for each function, they need to be put into a compact and accessible form. We concluded that a single worksheet for each function would be a convenient and accessible reporting format, which would be used centrally on a regular basis (probably annually). See the Planning Information Report worksheets at end of this chapter. A second reporting issue is how the data from the units will be compiled, summarized, and given back to the units. A computerized compilation system and standardized report format will probably be needed for these purposes.

Summary: The Evolution of a Management Information System

Our examination of possible input and output information for OSA took us farther down the road of developing cost accounting systems than we ever expected to go. We went this direction because we became convinced that OSA

will increasingly need to assemble and report solid, quantitative information about what it does and how much it costs to do it. The payoffs to be gained from a system for routinely developing this information are the speedy meeting of requests and a better basis for internal planning. We hope that the outline we have suggested is the groundwork for a workable management planning information system. Trial and error will no doubt refine it. Such a system, of course, provides only part of the data for planning. In terms of our enquiry model, these quantitative data represent examples of programmatic descriptions (funding, financial, and personnel information) and output measures (activity indicators and unit cost data). Additional data are also needed on the quality and impact of programs, issues which we take up in the next chapter.

OSA

Planning Information Report
Office for Student Affairs 19
University of Minnesota
Coordinator Area_____
Function_____
Fiscal Year_____

I. STAFFING DATA. Please write in number of budgeted FTE'S. If necessary, estimate FTE'S using average salary data for each staff classification from Attachment 2.

A. Professional staff FTE'S (full or part time personnel on civil service schedule A, MSP, faculty or academic staff appointments)

1. Regular academic staff FTE'S . . . . . _____
2. Regular civil service staff FTE'S . . . . . _____
3. Unassigned instruction staff FTE'S (funded on 402 dollars) . . . . . _____
4. Subtotal, A1 + A2 + A3 . . . . _____

B. Supporting staff FTE'S (full or part time personnel on civil service schedules B & C.

1. Supporting staff FTE'S . . . . . _____
2. Miscellaneous staff FTE'S (funded on 401 dollars) . . _____
3. Subtotal, B1 + B2 . . . . . _____

C. Total staff FTE'S (A4 + B3) . . . . . _____

II. FUNDING DATA. Please write in funds budgeted for this function.

A. Funds by expenditure category

1. Professional staff salary funds
   a. Regular academic staff salary funds . . . . . _____
   b. Regular civil service staff salary funds . . . . . _____
   c. Unassigned instruction staff 402 funds . . . . . _____
   d. Subtotal, 1a + 1b + 1c . . . . _____
2. Supporting staff salary funds
   a. Supporting staff salary funds . . . . . _____
   b. Miscellaneous staff 401 funds . . . . . _____
   c. Subtotal, 2a + 2b . . . . . _____
3. Total staff salary funds (1d + 2c) . . . . . _____
4. Fringe benefit funds (see Attachment 3 for fringe benefit multiplier) . . . . . _____
5. Supplies, expense, and equipment funds (total) . . . . _____

B. Total funds by source (Please break out funds for A3, A4, and A5 below).

1. 0100 funds . . . . . _____
2. State special funds . . . . . _____
3. Student services fees . . . . . _____
4. User fees . . . . . _____
5. Other funds (i.e., contracts, grants, gifts) . . . . . _____

C. Total, (B1 + B2 + B3 + B4 + B5) . . . . . _____

III. ACTIVITY INDICATORS. Please write in data for no more than three activity indicators for the area function. See attachment for definitions of activity indicators.

A. Participants (identified/nonduplicated) . . . . . _____
B. Participants (duplicated/not identified) . . . . . _____
C. Usages . . . . . _____
D. Personal contacts--brief . . . . . _____
E. Personal consultations/interviews (intensive) . . . . . _____
F. Transactions . . . . . _____
G. Events . . . . . _____
H. Reports completed . . . . . _____
I. Services provided . . . . . _____
J. Hours spent . . . . . _____
K. Client development . . . . . _____
L. Organizational support: Committees/panels . . . . . _____
M. Courses taught/credit hours . . . . . _____
N. Lectures/presentations . . . . . _____
O. Others _____ . . . . . _____
_____ . . . . . _____
_____ . . . . . _____

Please write in a brief description of each of the activity indicators you used so that we know exactly what everyone is counting.

IV. UNIT COSTS. Please compute unit costs by dividing total funds for this function, IIC, by each activity indicator specified in III above.

A. Indicator_____ Funds_____
B. Indicator_____ Funds_____
C. Indicator_____ Funds_____

V. COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS?

Thanks.

CHAPTER THREE

APPRAISING THE QUALITY AND IMPACT OF OSA SERVICES

In examining the literature on evaluation of student services and the practices of other universities and social agencies, we found it useful to distinguish between the concepts of quality and impact. The quality of a student service has to do with how well it is delivered. Issues of quality include such questions as the training and effectiveness of staff, the accuracy of data provided, and the effectiveness of unit supervisors. The impact of a student service has to do with the services' effects on its clients and the community it serves.

The impacts of most student services principally center on the ways in which programs change individuals who participate in them. Issues of impact include such questions as whether students who receive counseling are better equipped to deal with problems that they would be otherwise, whether those in support programs do better academically, and whether those who participate in student activities are more advanced in their personal development. Quality and impact frequently, but not always, go together. It is possible for a high quality service in which the staff delivers the service well to have relatively little impact because it serves a very small number of students or does not meet very important needs.

The distinction between quality and impact helps classify many of the techniques in the growing literature on the evaluation of student services. Most evaluation techniques in student affairs can be grouped into one of three broadly defined approaches, two oriented primarily toward quality issues, and one oriented primarily toward impact issues. The quality-oriented approaches are termed the management and self-study approaches, and the impact-oriented approaches are collectively labelled student outcomes approaches. While such a taxonomy is somewhat arbitrary, there is precedent for this classification in the student affairs literature. Fuller descriptions of these approaches and the rationales guiding them are included in Appendix D.

Our purpose here is to consider what each of these evaluation approaches has to offer OSA in evaluating its programs, and to derive from them specific evaluation techniques that OSA might productively apply in the future. We are well aware that not all that could be done to evaluate OSA programs should be done. We are also aware of the diversity of OSA services and the likely possibility that the technique appropriate for one unit may not be

appropriate for another. Thus our basic recommendation with respect to the assessment of quality and impact is that OSA units adopt at least one of the techniques outlined in this chapter.

Parameters for the Appraisal Process

Before proceeding with our discussion of the evaluation models and our recommendations for applying them, we would like to make some general observations about desirable characteristics for any appraisal techniques we might develop in OSA. These suggested guidelines come from our reading of an important new assessment of the field of evaluation (Cronbach et al, 1980), and our interviews with social agency personnel in the Twin Cities regarding their experiences with evaluation systems.

-- Evaluations should be regular but periodic. That is, they should be routinely scheduled so that people can count on their being done. However, they shouldn't be done so often that they are not cost effective--taking too much time, etc.

-- Evaluations should be done for someone and some purpose. They should identify the consumers of the information and the purposes to which it will be put. Failure to do so often dooms the effort to irrelevancy.

-- Evaluations should involve the program staff. No matter how they are packaged, evaluations involve a certain amount of threat. This threat can be reduced to the degree that staff feel committed to the project and believe that they have a hand in shaping it.

-- One should not underestimate the amount of time and effort needed in an evaluation. At the same time evaluations involve the staff, someone should be also responsible for coordinating the evaluation effort. If the person is part of the University staff, he or she should have time released for the effort.

-- Evaluations themselves should be scrutinized for their cost/effectiveness just as programs are. The evaluation should not be such a major effort that it drains significant resources from the delivery of sources (Some diversion is always necessary, of course). Too elaborate or detailed evaluations are likely to fail.

-- The evaluation process should fit the norms of the organization where the program is located. This is particularly important in higher education, which has a number of conventions, norms, rules, and standard ways of doing things that are very different from those in businesses and government agencies.

Quality Appraisal: The Management Approach

The management approach to the evaluation of the quality of student affairs programs is the application of what has come to be known as the traditional or goal-oriented evaluation approach, familiar to all students of the evaluation enterprise. Harpel (1978, pp. 19-20) distinguishes it from other approaches as follows:

> "Evaluation from a management standpoint....does not focus on the question of effectiveness alone or on testing theories of development but on measuring outcomes relative to the resources and purposes of the college or university at large. Since managers must channel resources and activities to produce a desired outcome, evaluation that meets their needs considers both effectiveness and efficiency. In other words, it relates outcomes to the achievement of objectiveness as well as to the resources required to operate the program--the budget."

From the viewpoint of the management approach, appraisal is an ongoing process, not a one-time or periodically recurring event. The data and techniques tied to the management approach are varied but all reflect the ongoing and regular nature of the process. The work volume indicators and their relationship to budgeting considered in the previous section clearly fit well under the management approach. But the approach does not confine itself solely to the measurement of quantity but often considers the quality of service as well. Frequently the quality assessments from the management approach revolve around the attainment of goals, through a Management by Objectives system, of the use of the Goal Attainment Scaling technique (See Appendix D). Also falling under the management approach is a new and evolving appraisal procedure, the analysis of levels of service. This concept is becoming popular at the University of Minnesota, and we think it deserves consideration for inclusion in an OSA appraisal system.

The Level of Service Procedure

At this time no comprehensive conceptual or technical definition of levels of service has emerged from discussions in the University's Planning Council nor from ongoing budget and program reviews of administrative units reporting to the Vice Presidents for Finance and Administration and Planning. One helpful approach to levels of service upon which we will rely heavily in this report has been prepared by Jim Preus, Director of Admissions and Records, for the Planning Council Drafting Group and presented to the Planning Council for information. Using this approach, a matrix contrasting ranges and

levels of services in five Financial Aids programs has been prepared. Present and potential levels of service are compared in each program (See Appendix E for examples of this approach in the financial aid and health service offices.)

From these initial efforts, several general assumptions about a levels of service approach may be drawn: the fundamental task for administrators is to decide at what service level output, funding, and quality will be maintained. As funding and output vary, so will the quality of services (although tradeoffs or maintenance of existing quality are possibilities). As quality appears to improve or decline, the levels at which services will be offered will be adjusted.

The rationale for the analysis of levels of service has been discussed in the public budgeting literature and has been also, we suspect, intuitively understood and at times applied by administrators in the University's service and support units.

The levels of service approach appears to be related to the theory and practice of performance budgeting, a budgeting system widely practiced in varying forms in public and educational institutions. Performance budgeting, an attempt to allocate resources on the basic of qualitative and quantitative outputs, consists chiefly of the following procedures (Schick, 1971):

1. The definition or classification of agency functions or services.

2. The identification of specific activities or meaningful units of work which constitute these functions or services.

3. The identification, measurement, and costing of outputs related to these units of work.

4. The determination of alternative levels of agency funding given likely changes in resources, projected unit costs and output volumes, the mix and quality of services, and institutional or external political constraints.

The emphasis in a performance budgeting system is on the preparation and analysis of quantitative and factual data for purposes of budget decision making. While the techniques in this system are often detailed and complicated, its purposes may be narrow. In contrast, the use of levels of service suggests a concern for the direction and impact of services and a commitment to the development and assessment of descriptive data to inform planning, budgeting, appraisal, and day-to-day operations decisions. In an overall sense, it is a managerial tool, a procedure for improving the effectiveness of services, not simply a budgetary device.

If implemented in OSA units, the levels of service approach might well involve the following or similar procedures:

1. Identification/description of broad functions or services by department or coordinator's area.

2. Description of discrete functional activities in terms of multiple levels of service or performance; i.e., a scale of service levels or options such as low, medium, high or highest levels of services. In this step potential and present levels or services are identified.

3. Estimates of funding requirements for each level of performance or service.

4. Based upon analysis of selected criteria and performance indicators, the making of decisions about maintenance or changes in levels of OSA services.

In making these decisions, OSA department heads or coordinators might use a variety of criteria, weighting each according to professional judgment and current OSA and University policies. Criteria proposed or used previously by University of Minnesota executive officers in planning and budgeting processes have often included: centrality, need or demand, legal or policy mandate, uniqueness, availability of alternative delivery systems, and quality.

Each of these criteria is applicable to analysis and decisions about levels of service. However, the assessment of quality, while difficult, is especially important, since more readily available quantitative measures or outputs may at best present a narrow or partial picture of service impact or unit effectiveness. If quality of service is truly a concern of OSA professionals, then attempts to assess it must be part of administrative life.

Criteria which might assist OSA department heads and coordinators in assessing the quality of unit services include the following:

1. Timeliness -- promptness, continuity of services.
2. Comprehensiveness -- breadth/range, diversity of services.
3. Depth -- thoroughness/extent of each service.
4. Scale -- appropriateness to service need or demand.
5. Accessibility -- availability of staff, proximity of services.
6. Vitality -- qualifications, knowledge, achievements, morale, training and development of staff; creativity/innovativeness of services.
7. Publicity -- availability/dissemination of materials describing services/up-to-date information about services.
8. Cost-effectiveness -- low or high costs vs performance.

To apply these or similar criteria in a practical sense, measures or assessments of performance are needed, both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Among those which OSA staff might use are activity and unit cost data from the OSA Planning Information Report, data from client attitude or satisfaction studies, findings of appraisal or accreditation teams, and comparative performance data from the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) or inter-institutional studies.

As with any managerial approach to evaluation, the levels of service procedure has its disadvantages. To describe all unit functions in terms of levels of service is a detailed, time-consuming exercise, one whose perceived benefits may not be apparent or compelling to OSA heads or coordinators. Although a decentralized approach, levels of service reflects a central planning and control bias potentially at odds with the usual participative, collegial notion of university governance or management. In particular, the techniques and language of a levels of service approach may seem to be a mechanistic and ill-conceived application of administrative thinking better suited for a non-academic environment. Additionally, the cost of developing data bases and preparing levels of service reports should not be underestimated.

In its favor, the levels of service approach appears to be a pragmatic assessment tool which could be applied in periods of unit growth, stabilization, and contraction. Its use might promote more flexible and informed decision making since selection among documented and multiple service options is an objective. While simple in concept, this approach emphasizes the use of comprehensive (i.e., quantitative and qualitative) performance measures, an innovative practice in student services and higher education programs in general. Moreover, levels of service decisions will not only give direction to OSA operations but might well assist the Vice President for Student Affairs in developing recommendations for major institution-wide administrative processes, such as retrenchment and reallocation, biennial request preparation, planning initiatives or other reviews of administrative service and support units.

Quality Appraisal: The Self-Study Approach

A second approach to the appraisal of the quality of student affairs programs is the self-study approach. Pace (1978, p. 15) defines it as follows:

> "College self-study....can be almost anything a group wants to study on the college; it need not be a total review of institutional purposes and programs. Its main distinguishing feature is that it is designed, conducted, and interpreted internally, not by an external evaluation. This characteristic at least offers the potential for making evaluation a learning activity for those who engage in it....A successful self-study model requires several ingredients. The topic or focus of the study must be recognized as important. The people most directly concerned about it and most likely to be affected by the results must be active in carrying out the study. Maintaining active participation requires continuous and open communication, discussion, and debate. The interpretation of results reflect consensus. And finally, plans must be made and followed for translating the conclusions into appropriate actions."

The self-study approach is a very broad one which can accommodate many different types of data and techniques. This is because the model emphasizes process more than specific technologies. This aspect of the approach is appealing because many evaluation failures are due more to problems in the process of developing and using data than to problems in the data.

Self-study approaches nearly always involve some type of review team, a group of individuals from inside the organization, outside it, or from both inside and out. These persons gather data, assess the data, and report to decision makers on their findings. Teams are usually appointed to examine a program on a periodic but regular basis.

The advantages of the review team concept are that it can meet many of the desirable criteria for the evaluation process. It can be highly cost/effective, particularly if it utilizes team members whose time can be donated to the effort. It is flexible and can use a wide range of data depending on the situation. Reports of a review team are usually delivered to someone who has authority for programmatic decisions. Review systems often detail what will happen to the findings, how they will be discussed and applied. The approach is quite compatible with traditions and norms of higher education.

The major disadvantage of the review team technique is that it is open to a variety of subtle and unsubtle abuses. Most obviously, the evaluation can be manipulated through the selection of the review team members. Even when this is not intended, maverick review team members may sabotage the operation of the review. The review can be done autocratically. There is no guarantee that the program staff is actively involved in and committed to the review. The review can also be made into mere "window dressing" in which the team just goes through the motions of appraisal without seriously

delving into the effectiveness of the program. Finally, there is the problem of the subjectivity of the process. While review committees may choose to gather "hard" data, they are not necessarily obligated to do so. Much of their analysis may be based solely on their or others' subjective assessments.

Review teams have a long history in higher education. They have been most widely used to assess the quality of academic programs. The University of Minnesota has an ongoing process of periodic team reviews of individual academic departments. In addition, accrediting bodies in higher education usually use review teams to decide whether or not to accredit curricula and programs. The use of review teams to assess the quality of support and service offices appears more limited. While undoubtedly there have been many one-time reviews of individual programs, only fairly recently have there been many attempts to build systems of ongoing team reviews for student affairs and other support programs. Student affairs divisions at the University of Iowa, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of California have begun to develop systems for team evaluation.

A Suggested Review Team Appraisal System for OSA

The potential benefits of a self-study appraisal system are great enough that OSA should consider the development of a self-study appraisal system. In looking for guidance in developing the details of a self-study approach, we found that most student affairs applications were too new and ill-defined to be immediately applicable. Systems which have been well refined, such as academic accreditation reviews, were not directly relevant to student affairs.

The exception to these observations about the development of self-study models for student affairs is the University of California. With the help of a grant from the National Science Foundation grant, California worked out an appraisal system for support services, including student affairs units. The system has been used in several appraisals of student affairs units. The results of the model's application has been generally favorable, resulting in some demonstrable improvements and cost savings.

The California model is sufficiently well developed that it merits attention as a starting place for the design of an OSA system. Thus we have described the main features of the model, as it might be applied to OSA and also appended two examples of guidelines used for applying the model to two student services, a financial aid office and a health service. We offer the California approach not as a "magic method" to be adopted wholesale here, but as a reasonable starting place for development of an OSA review team appraisal system.

Administration of the Appraisal. Policies for the appraisal system are developed by an assessment steering committee usually consisting of 4-6 campus officers with significant administrative responsibilities. The steering committee selects areas to review, approves recommendations made by review teams, and monitors actions taken in response to the review. The steering committee's duties may be part of the functions of an ongoing group. One member of the steering committee is the appraisal coordinator. This person is responsible for the implementation of the appraisals--making sure that they are organized and functioning properly. The coordinator also keeps the steering committee and the chief executive informed of the review teams' activities. In the case of OSA the current OSA coordinators group could logically serve the function of the steering committee, and the coordinator of the appraisal could be an Associate or Assistant Vice President.

Review Teams. Review teams of 3-7 persons are appointed on an ad hoc basis for individual reviews, and give part of their time for the duration of the review. Team members are given temporary released time from some of their other duties. Teams represent a combination of managerial skill, technical expertise and campus knowledge. For OSA services, a team might include someone familiar with the services, persons expert in analysis and evaluation, and someone who manages services in aother part of the University besides OSA. Review teams might draw on staff, faculty, administrators, or students for their membership.

Staff. One or more individuals--.5 to 1.5 FTE's--for the duration of the review is responsible for administering the review and data gathering efforts. Hopefully, the same persons are involved in several reviews so that they provide continuity and expert assistance to the review team. Central support staff are logical candidates for this role, but other OSA professionals with evaluation and project management expertise would also be well suited to the task.

Scope of the Review. Reviews are recommended to be done on functional areas, although they could be done on departments. Reviews would be done according to a rolling schedule, following policy developed by the steering committee. Teams review the policies, programs, and management of the area or unit in terms of quantity and quality of service, cost effectiveness, staff performance, and relationship to organizational goals.

Procedures. The duration of the review will vary with the size and complexity of the area, although most reviews take approximately 12-15 weeks. The review team guides its work according to two questionnaires or checklists. The first is designed to focus on the organization's overall management, and the second focusing on a particular functional area (See Appendix F for examples of checklists for health service and financial aid offices). The checklists simply highlight areas and issues that probably should be considered. Close interaction with program managers and staff is expected and encouraged. The review team examines a broad range of data, including annual reports, budgets, satisfaction surveys, usage figures, and interviews with staff and clients.

Report. The review team report specifies clear recommendations about change or continuance of programs, policies, and procedures. The recommendations will not necessarily specify the details of implementation, leaving these to the line managers. The report is sent on to the steering committee and then to the line managers and supervisors.

Actions. The line managers and supervisors react to the report and develop a plan for implementing its recommendations (some or all). The steering committee monitors formally or informally the implementation of the recommendations.

Any application of the model would have to involve a system accommodated to the current administrative structure and policies of the organization. Again, we note that the discussion here is only an outline of a more detailed approach, and that we regard it only as the most useful starting point that we could find. However, we do believe that a self-study, team review system of quality appraisal makes sense for OSA because of its potential cost-effectiveness and its comparability with University norms.

Impact Assessment: Student Outcomes Approaches

Both the management and self-study approaches to evaluation of student affairs programs focus primarily on issues of quality, how well services are being performed, and how they might be improved. These approaches are relatively less well equipped to deal with issues of impact, the effects services have on their clients and the community at large. Different approaches are needed to assess impact.

Student affairs programs have their impact chiefly through the ways in which they benefit or otherwise affect the individuals they serve. Broadly speaking, student affairs programs benefit their student clients in two ways: first, by aiding student personal development through education in areas not covered by classroom instruction, and secondly, by helping students solve problems and supporting them so that they can take advantage of the educational opportunities available to them. Assessments of the impact of most student affairs programs should logically be assessments of either the degree to which the programs help students benefit in personal development or the degree to which the programs help students solve problems and succeed in the academic environment.

OSA units will necessarily differ in which, if any, impact assessments are most appropriate. The impact of some services, such as the SODC student leadership program, is intended to be almost exclusively in the development area. Others such as the Student Counseling Bureau's Reading and Study Skills

Center concentrate on problem-solving support, while still others may emphasize both development and problem solving. Further complicating the issue is the fact that some OSA operations, particularly in Admissions and Records, provide small routine services to students, or do not directly serve students at all. For these programs quality may be a more salient concern than impact.

The remainder of this chapter describes some general directions for assessing the impact of student affairs programs on both the personal development of students and their academic success. The diversity of OSA services and the complexity of impact studies necessarily make the discussion of impact more general and less specific in recommendations than the discussions of other issues have been.

Assessing Student Development

Student development is the dominant theme in the current student personnel literature. Research is proceeding on student development along a variety of dimensions, including cognitive, moral, and personality development. Technologies and instruments have been produced to assess these many different facets of development. Many student development theorists argue that the evaluation of student services requires the application of these technologies to produce data on measured developmental outcomes:

> "Efforts to design programs responsive to the developmental needs of students must show that they will make a difference.... Such evaluation calls for more than the use of rating forms to discover participants' satisfaction with a program and more than simple reports of numbers served and subjective statements about staff abilities. These data alone are inadequate as bases for deciding to modify or curtail existing programs or inaugurate new ones." (Miller & Prince, 1976, pp. 134-5).

From this point of view, evaluations of the impact of a service on student development require fairly rigorous experimental, or at least quasi-experimental, designs using appropriate measures of development with known psychometric characteristics.

The use of developmental assessments as evaluation tools presents a number of practical and conceptual problems. First, the costs of doing studies of developmental outcomes are often higher than the costs of other evaluation techniques. Compared to less rigorous techniques such as opinion surveys, experimental and quasi-experimental designs usually require more money, disruption of service, and effort from both clients and staff. Secondly, many student affairs programs are sufficiently complex and multidimensional

that they may affect several different dimensions of student development, or not affect the particular dimension being measured. Because most developmental measures are designed to assess only one dimension of development, developmentally-oriented evaluations of ongoing services must either employ long batteries of measures, or run the risk that a measure will be insensitive to the effects of the service. A third obstacle to the use of developmental measures in evaluating student services is the quality of the measurement techniques themselves. The popularity of developmental concepts has led to the proliferation of new measurement techniques, many of which have comparatively unknown or weak psychometric properties. Even some older and well-known techniques such as Kohlberg's moral development dilemmas have come under heavy fire from methodologists. Finally, the use of developmental findings in making programmatic decisions is unproven and uncertain. Despite the emphasis on development in the literature, there is little evidence that developmental findings are very often used by administrators in decision making. There may be a number of reasons why this is the case. The use of developmental measures may be too new to have become widespread, or administrators may not be sufficiently familiar with them to explore their potential. On the other hand, the current measures may simply be perceived as irrelevant to such practical problems as whether a new staff member is needed or where a mandated budget cut should be taken.

Because of the problems yet to be worked out in applying developmental approaches to student affairs evaluations, we do not have specific suggestions for assessing the impact of OSA programs on student development. It is not our intention, however, to discourage efforts in this area. On the contrary, we think that such efforts should be encouraged. The concepts and assessment techniques in the field of student development are becoming more refined and perhaps more practical. We would particularly call attention to the work being done by a group at Harvard in the area of assessing competencies (described in a forthcoming book by Winter, McClelland, and Stewart, 1981).[4] The Harvard group has developed a number of measures of intellectual, and interpersonal competencies not tapped by traditional standardized tests. These and similar instruments might have considerable potential in documenting the educational impacts of student services. Also meriting attention is the work on student development transcripts and competency checklists by Brown and others. These techniques are appealing because they are potentially more practical for use in evaluating ongoing services than are other developmental techniques (See Appendix D for a further discussion of these techniques).

In some ways, the results of developmental studies are less important than the mere fact of doing them. Thinking in terms of student development

and how to measure it seems often to lead to creativity and innovation in the design of programs. The new student leadership development program in the Student Organization Development Center is a good example. Concepts and measures derived from the growing literature in student development might be creatively applied to programs in other OSA units as well.

Appraising Student Success

Some student affairs programs are legitimately (although not exclusively) evaluated in terms of their contribution to helping students succeed in the academic environment and ultimately in life. These are services which are oriented toward helping students solve problems and adjust to the demands of their roles. They include Boynton Health Service, the Financial Aid Office, the Student Counseling Bureau, the Minnesota Women's Center, and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs.

The University of Minnesota has had a tradition of landmark studies in assessing the impact of student service on student success. The Campbell and Volksy et al studies of counseling are noteworthy examples. It is our impression, however, that impact data of this type have not been given much attention in recent years. Our review of recent OSA evaluation studies showed only a few studies comparing the grades and graduation rates of recipients versus nonrecipients of student services. The lack of good data on student success may handicap some programs in the competition for funding. This problem may have affected OMSSA, which presents student success data to the state legislature in support of its last funding request, but was criticized for not having more and better data of this type.

We think that the University as a whole should look at ways of improving its data on student success, and that some OSA units should consider studies which relate participation in programs to pragmatically-defined measures of success. Measures of graduation rates, attrition rates, grade point averages, job placement, and life satisfaction all may be relevant to understanding the impact of particular services.

Student success studies are likely to be most useful if they are routinized, so that they are planned and conducted on a regular basis. With repetition of studies, trends can be inferred. For some programs the repetitions need not be very frequent, since their impacts will not vary in the short run. For others, such as specialized tutorial programs, routine and frequent collection of student success data may be quite helpful. The development of systems which would allow the quick production of data on success variables should be very much encouraged.

Survey/Feedback Techniques: A Substitute for Other Quality and Impact Data

Given the complexities of measuring program outcomes and applying such outcome data to decision-making, many programs have used more easily obtained and less costly survey data as a substitute for outcome measurement. Individuals presumed to have a useful perspective on the program are surveyed, and the results of the survey are reported or "fed back" to decision makers or to survey respondents. The results are then discussed and related to decisions, sometimes using structured question and discussion techniques.

The survey/feedback approach has a long history in business, government, and higher education, and its popularity continues to grow. In practice, data from nearly all the other evaluation approaches are usually supplemented with survey data of one type or another. At most universities, student surveys are the primary tool for assessing the quality of instruction. As our review of current OSA planning data has shown, surveys have been the mainstay of OSA's previous evaluation efforts. At one time or another most OSA units have conducted client satisfaction studies. Student affairs units at other universities have also relied heavily on various types of surveys in their planning and evaluation efforts.

Survey data are appealing because they are relatively easy and inexpensive to collect, offering the possibility of getting a large amount of information for relatively little cost. Surveys can be used to gather opinions on both quality and impact. Moreover, they are very compatible with the norms in higher education for relatively democratic and consensual decision making. Finally they are often less ambiguous to interpret than are data on measured outcomes.

The major drawback of the survey/feedback approach is its subjectivity. Surveys are merely compilations of opinions, subject to all the biases and lack of knowledge inherent in opinions themselves. Those surveyed may not be in a position to accurately understand and know about a wide range of issues relevant to programmatic decisions. It is not a complete over-simplification to say that most satisfaction surveys find that respondents like the program in question, and that most need surveys find that respondents say that there is a need for the program in question, regardless of the nature of the program. Additionally, self reports are often at variance with measured outcomes. For example, the degree to which graduates say they gained competency in writing may vary considerably from the results of tests of writing skill.

Like other outcome assessments, the survey/feedback approach gains considerable power if it is routinized. If surveys are repeated using similar methodologies, then trends can be detected. Knowing whether satisfaction with a service is going up or down is considerably more meaningful than simply knowing that a certain percentage of respondents were satisfied at one point in time. The major deficiency in OSA's previous use of surveys has been the lack of routinization and the consistency that goes with it. With a few exceptions most of OSA's surveys have been one-time studies in response to a particular issue. While these studies have met immediate needs, they have not yielded the sort of data that is useful for long-range planning and assessment. OSA should consider the possibility of developing a system of surveys that would allow for the development of longer-range trend data.

Our reviews of literature and the practices of other universities did not reveal a detailed system for conducting surveys on a regular basis in student affairs. Most student affairs divisions appear to be like OSA, relying heavily on ad hoc surveys. Some universities, however, are beginning to think in terms of longer term survey systems. The University of Texas has been experimenting with the ecosystem model (See Appendix D for a fuller discussion) which involves systematically surveying various groups of students on their perceptions of the campus environment, and then feeding back the results into structured discussions about their implications. The University of Colorado and Northern Illinois have experimented with innovative technologies in the development of satisfaction surveys, utilizing mark-sense scoring of on-the-spot surveys with extremely quick turnaround of results. However, no clear conceptual model has emerged to guide survey systems for student affairs. The closest thing to such a model is the combination of <u>needs</u> surveys and <u>satisfaction</u> surveys.

A frequent focus of the survey research on campuses is student need in an area where services might be provided--health, financial aid, counseling. Need studies are typically done for a particular group of interest, such as commuter students, older than average students, women, minority students. A very frequent type of article in the <u>Journal of College Student Personnel</u> is "A study of the _____ (counseling, health, growth) needs of _____ (minority, commuter, handicapped) students," using a survey methodology. If this type of study is repeated across time and across groups, then it is possible not only to make inferences about trends, but also whether a particular group has more or less need in an area than another group. Needs studies can

be used not only for program planning but also for summative evaluations of impact. If over time, students report that their needs in one area are being increasingly met by a service, then the service can be assumed to be having a beneficial impact.

A similar logic applies to satisfaction surveys. Satisfaction studies are most useful in the assessment of program quality. If satisfaction with a service is assessed over time and across services in fairly similar ways, then inferences can be made about the quality of services vis a vis themselves and each other. Reports of satisfaction surveys also are very frequent in the student personnel literature, testifying to their ease of conduct and their perceived usefulness. There is definitely a need for consistent approaches to the study of student needs and satisfaction with student services. The American College Testing Service has recently begun to market some general standardized instruments for student service needs and satisfaction assessments. Other instruments will probably also be developed.

OSA should consider the development of a routinized needs/satisfaction survey system. The features of the system should include:

A regular schedule: Trend data could be developed in both the satisfaction and needs areas if a schedule for periodic surveying were laid out. Every few years the satisfaction of students with a given service might be assessed. If team reviews were also used, then satisfaction studies might be meshed with the team review schedule. In fact, the California model of team reviews routinely uses client satisfaction surveys as part of the review. Likewise one might develop a schedule for periodically looking at the service needs of various groups of students. One year one might look at the needs of commuter students, another the needs of minority students, and so on.

Consistent questions and methods: Whenever possible the questions and methodologies used in different surveys should be comparable. This allows direct comparisons across services and groups. This specification will be limited by the need to touch on specific issues with regard to individual services. Perhaps a core survey instrument could be developed and adapted or supplemented with additional questions specific to the issues of a particular service or group.

Central Coordination: A system of surveys might initially be coordinated centrally in OSA by staff experienced in these areas. After the methodology is developed, they might then be "given away" to units or review teams to conduct themselves.

A system of survey research, despite its deficiencies, merits consideration as a part of an overall design for planning and evaluation data.

Final Observations about Quality and Impact Assessment

Considerations of quality are naturally more compelling to program staff and administrators than are considerations of impact. The techniques suggested here for quality assessment are likely to yield concrete, useful suggestions for improving service to students. Yet it would be a mistake to neglect entirely the more difficult area of impact assessment. The time may come, perhaps unexpectedly, when decision makers in the University or in the legislature will seriously raise the question of whether large scale student services are needed on this campus. Should that happen, basic data on the impact of services will be very much needed. Even if the question of the basic need for services is not raised, impact data can be very helpful in documenting requests for additional funding for programs. Fortunately, the nature of many programs and their outcomes are such that large scale impact studies do not have to be done very often.

References

1. Cronbach, L. & Associates. Toward reform of program evaluation, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

2. Harpel, R. Evaluating programs from a management perspective. In G.R. Hanson (Ed.), New directions for student services, No. 1: Evaluating program effectiveness, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

3. Pace, C.R., & Friedlander, J. Approaches to evaluation: models and perspectives. In New directions for student services, No. 1: Evaluating program effectiveness, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

4. Winter, D.G., McClelland, D.C., & Stewart, A.J. A new case for the liberal arts: Assessing institutional goals and student development, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. To be published in October, 1981.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In conducting our work we found that we had to guard against some natural hazards in the field of evaluation and planning. It is all too easy to get carried away, recommending new and complicated systems without regard for their practicality. So too, it is easy to become moralistic about the subjects of evaluation and accountability, preaching the gospel to those who are presumed to be either ignorant of such things or resistant to them. To deal with these hazards we frequently reminded ourselves that planning and evaluation are and always should be secondary to the actual provision of services. Planning and evaluation information systems should not be unduly cumbersome, expensive and demanding of staff time and energy. We tried to keep our recommended systems within the realm of practicality by making our cost/output system flexible enough to accommodate modifications based on experience, and offering several options for quality and impact assessment.

At the same time that we are committed to the practicality of new planning and information systems, we are equally committed to their necessity and desirability. The current stress on accountability in publicly-funded programs and the climate of diminishing resources in higher education demand that student affairs be able to produce good data on the extent and quality of its services. In our judgment OSA will have to become more systematic in these areas than it has in the recent past. The benefits from doing so are not all negative ones of meeting external imposed requirements. With careful design, improved information systems will aid staff in making programmatic decisions, and ultimately will help provide better service to students.

The University of Minnesota has traditionally been a leader in the development of student affairs programs and concepts underlying them. The time is right for Minnesota to also assert leadership in the planning and evaluation aspects of student personnel work.

APPENDICES

An Inventory of OSA Planning and Evaluation Reports

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

OMSSA

Learning Ctrs.

1. daily activity reports using checks to identify type and mode (telephone, office, field, mail, etc.) of service, staff hours might also be logged.
2. statement of mission, goals, objectives

HOUSING

Residence halls

1. annual "Fact Sheet" report on amount of student activity in each hall, type of activity, staff hours, cost of activities.
2. monthly financial reports (building budget statements, accounts receivable, food cost control program).
3. statements of mission, goals, objectives; also MBO statement on on-going and short range objectives.
4. staff/professional activities: listed in Annual Report; also general information: number of applicants, waiting list, cost increases, hall rates, etc.
5. residence hall policies, regulations, services in "Living In" pamphlet.
6. Big Ten and other college housing office reports about services and costs are available.

Off-campus Housing

1. staff/professional activities: listed in Off-campus Housing Office Annual Report.
2. services included in statement of mission, goals, objectives.
3. average rates of campus and Twin Cities units in "Quarterly Report of Average Rental Rates."

Campus Rental Properties	1. average rental rates in "Quarterly Report of Average Rental Rates." 2. services included in mission, goals, objectives statement.
HEALTH SERVICES	
Boynton	1. statement of mission, goals, objectives. 1. narrative description of services offered and professional staff activities by department in Annual Report. 3. fiscal reports regularly supplied to Central Administration and U of M committees; Medical Group Management Association comparative analysis of costs.
Radiation and Env. Health	1. service included in mission, goals, objectives statement. 2. narrative description of services offered in Boynton Health Service Annual Report.
Chemical Abuse Program	1. narrative description of direct and "indirect" (information dissemination efforts, for example) services; number of staff in Chemical Use and Abuse Counseling Program Annual Report.
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	
Unions	1. MBO/PPBS reports of programs, objectives and costs. 2. Financial information provided for last biennial request. 3. Narrartive descriptions of programs in regular annual reports.
SODC	1. Financial information presented for biennial request. 2. Reports of staff time tally sampling (forthcoming).
USLS	1. Schedule of Benefits Handbook describing programs to

clients.

2. Staffing and budget information in biennial request documents.
3. Costs, caseload, and program information in regular annual reports.

Rec Sports

1. Informational brochures for participants/newsletters.
2. Narrative descriptions of programs in regular annual reports.
3. Financial information in biennial request documents.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

Counseling Bur.

1. mission, goals, objectives statement.
2. Annual Report - none identified.

ISAO, Special Counseling Office, MWC

1. services included in mission, goals, objectives statement.
2. narrative program, service, staff activity descriptions in Annual Reports. ISAO includes financial aid programs.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

All units

1. mission, goals, objectives (not by unit)
2. partial descriptions of SSS continuing and new services, projects, policies in a Jim Preus one-shot report.
3. 0100 budget totals and functions by department - a memo prepared for the Budget Executive.
4. description of collegiate and BE bulletins and brochures

in "Obtaining and Using Student Information" pamphlet.

Admissions and Records	1. activities of Records and Registration unit in reports prepared for "work flow monitoring system."
Prospective Students	1. budget dollars, services, activities, number of staff in Annual Report.
Financial Aid	1. services and office organization: description of types and funds for financial aid programs.

VPSA

Handicapped Students	1. no materials received as yet.
Student Life Studies	1. staff/professional activities described in last Annual Report, 75-76. 2. support services included in VPSA mission, goals, objectives statement.
VP's Office	1. mission, goals, objectives statement. 2. budgeted functions of OSA units: sources of funding and types of FTE staffing by unit; descriptions of services in "Quantitative Means of Workload and Service in OSA," 1978.

CLIENTELE DESCRIPTIONS

OMSSA

1. clients by sex and type from daily activity reports.
2. information on client characteristics.
3. certifications by ethnic group.

HOUSING

Residence halls, Off-campus Housing and Campus Property Rentals

1. detailed demographic studies of students in "Housing the University Student," last completed 74-75, to be prepared in 80-81; includes data such as distribution of students, residence type on and off campus, distribution of students by zip code, area, etc.

Residence Halls

1. age of students, other demographic information in annual "Fact Report."

HEALTH SERVICES

Boynton

1. sex and type of patients noted in daily, monthly, annual service counts (M/F, student/non-student. dependent, etc.); some data in Annual Report.

Envir. Health

1. percentage of service time to on- and off-campus groups--in Annual report.

Chemical Abuse

1. type of patients (students, faculty/staff, others) in program on and off campus (Annual Report).
2. description of patient needs (Annual Report).
3. self-description by patients (Annual Report).

STUDENT ACTIVITIES

Unions

1. Annual traffic surveys of Union users.
2. Rausch and Harrold 78 survey of student needs.
3. SLSP 79 fees survey data on users and non-users of unions.

SODC
1. Harrold and Upton study (Spring 79) of student activities.
2. Harrold studies of student leisure activities.
3. Forthcoming reports on users of student organization workshops.

USLS
1. Routine client descriptors gathered from USLS intake forms. (weekly reports summarized in annual reports)
2. SLSP study of student legal needs (75).
3. SLSP fees survey data (79) on usage of USLS and other services.

Rec Sports
1. Characteristics of participants and non-participants from A&R quarterly registration surveys.
2. SLSP fees sruvey data on users and non-users.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

SCB
1. demographic data on individual clients collected on monthly to annual basis from intake forms and counselors.

ISAO
1. types of students, national origin, fields of study (Annual Reports).

MWC
1. brief narrative description of clientele ("overview" section of Annual Report).
2. received CURA grant in 78-79 to fund "Older Student Needs Assessment" study.
3. demographic information on clients (organizations/individuals: marital, employment, student status; education, age, etc.) in Annual Report).

Special Couns.
1. students by sex, complaint and residence in Annual Report.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

A & R	1. types and users of A & R information in "Obtaining and Using Student Information" pamphlet.
Prospective Students	1. types of users on and off campus (minority students, state residents, non-residents, VPs' offices, etc.). (Annual Report).
Financial Aid	1. financial aid by sex, racial minority (college Annual Report).

VPSA

Handicapped Students	1. no materials available.
VP's Office	1. identification of student organizations, service clientele, participants, specific groups, University offices, off-campus agencies and institutions in VP Zanders' "Quantitative Measures" data report.
Student Life Studies	1. identified professional obligations to internal (VP's Task Forces and Committees, students) and external public (professional associations, audiences).

OUTPUT MEASURES

OMSSA

1. number of minority students enrolled (activity reports).

HOUSING

Residence Halls

1. MBO-generated data: food costs per meal eaten vs budget, food service productivity ratios, etc. (Annual Report).
2. brief summary of student behavioral problems (Annual Report).
3. "Fact Sheet" data: number of meals served, beds occupied.
4. unit costs in "Housing the University Student," percentage distribution of per capita monthly rental costs, for example.

Off-campus

1. counts of listings, phone contacts, referrals, complaint interviews--much of them displayed in a comparative fashion (3 years of data) in Annual Report.
2. some of Residence Hall-type output data may also be available, but evidence is lacking.

Campus Property Rentals

1. Number of beds occupied.

Much of the above data is maintained daily, reported bimonthly, monthly and annually.

HEALTH SERVICES

Boynton

1. daily, monthly, annual counts of visits, consultations, prescriptions filled, lab tests, injections, X-rays, etc.--collected by departments, some included in Annual Report.
2. Blue Cross/Blue Shield utilization rates of services.

3. ad hoc studies about particular policy problems.
4. Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation report.
5. American College Health Association report "On Quantitative Measures of Services Rendered."
6. external trend data--monthly report of department operational indicators such as contacts, man hours, and cost bases. Comparative analysis of health clinics within the American College Health Association.

Envir. Health

1. types of services to meet federal and state mandated requirements (Annual Report).
2. monthly work effort report: hours of service to units, campuses, population groups recorded in a one week per month sample for quarterly compilation--presently under review.

Chemical Abuse

1. number and percentage of clients served: program activities: therapy sessions, workshops (Annual Report).
2. description of client behavior, problems (Annual Report).

STUDENT ACTIVITIES

Unions

1. Traffic figures from annual traffic surveys.
2. Attendance counts at union events.
3. Revenues received by revenue charging operations (e.g., bowling).
4. MBO goal attainment reports.

SODC

1. Occasional reports of numbers of persons served at workshops.
2. Planned tallies of consultations held with students.
3. SOFD--Detailed records of student organization financial transactions.

USLS
1. Detailed reports of numbers and types of clients served from intake form system.
2. Regular reports of staff services delivered to clients.
3. Occasional headcounts at workshops.

Rec Sports
1. Detailed counts of the numbers of participations in Rec Sports.
2. Amounts of funds raised.
3. Reports of feasibility and need studies for new facilities.
4. SLSP fees survey (79) data on extent of usage.
5. Reports from usage questions asked on A&R registration surveys.

STUDENT DEVEL. CENTERS

SCB
1. monthly, quarterly, annual reports of quantitative measures: number of interviews, group sessions, credits taught, clients tested, tests scored, etc.

ISAO
1. "interview issues" by category and priority order; quantitative measures: number and types of interviews, student enrollment in language classes, number of financial aid recipients, etc. (Annual Report).

Spec. Couns. Office
1. demographic data: number of cases, number of interview calls, number of disciplinary complaints, etc. (Annual Report).

MWC
1. primarily contact and traffic count data.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

All units
1. number of students, applications, publications, etc.
2. descriptions of new services/developments, such as computer development and publications (Preus report).

A & R	1. in Work Flow System, number of students served by functions (daily, weekly, monthly). 2. types of student data collected and disseminated by A&R ("Obtaining and Using Student Information' pamphlet).
Financial Aid	1. number of recipients by program, growth in student aid, etc. (Annual Report).
Prospective Students	1. contacts: number of referrals, telephone calls, number of "Minority Student Recruiting" reports, number of visits and contacts in high school programs, etc.

VPSA

Student Life	1. reports, research papers and publications, task force and committee roles, student advisees (Annual Report, 75-76).
VP's Office	1. quantitative measures by unit (Zander). 2. similar data for 5 year period for SSS, SCB, several other units prepared for B.E.
Handicapped Students	1. no materials available

IMPACT INDICANTS

OMSSA
1. performance of students (retention, GPA).

Housing

Residence Halls
1. biennial student evaluations of resident assistants (residence hall evaluation form).
2. MBO-generated documents, performance indicators, timetables (Annual Report).
3. changes resulting from policy or program developments, i.e., creation of "new judicial model" leading to improvements in disciplinary processes (Annual Report).
4. quantitative measures: resident return rates, for example (Annual Report).

Off-campus
1. will prepare a study "relating contents to students actually placed" (Annual Report).

Campus Property Rentals
1. no information on client satisfaction, service impact.

HEALTH SERVICES (data from interviews and Annual Reports)

Boynton
1. consumer satisfaction surveys on ad hoc and regular basis.
2. "quality assurance measures" in reports by Professional Activities Committee.
3. comparative analysis, particularly cost data, provided by American College Health Association and Medical Group Management Association.
4. accreditation and "peer review" reports.
5. utilization data provided for Blue Cross/Blue Shield.
6. impact/evaluation of activities/service cited by individual departments in Annual Report, i.e., staff

questionnaire in Nursing Department, quality assessment indices under development in Mental Health Program area, etc.

Envir. Health
1. reviews of accident data.
2. impact of services designed to meet OSHA and state accident, health and safety requirements.

Chemical Abuse
1. client contracts/attainment of goals.
2. use of client "Drug Logs."
3. lack comprehensive evaluation system to determine extent of impact, especially of rehabilitation services.

STUDENT DEVEL. CENTERS
1. impact assessments not routinely gathered; some follow-up surveys and surveys of non-clients by ISAO and SCB.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

All units
1. impact on University policy development through participation in Access Task Force, other study committees.
2. interest in but little development of qualitative data,
3. "Former Student Survey."

A & R
1. descriptions of impact of new facilities, new program developments such as computer systems.
2. uses of student information in policy and decision-making processes (Student Information pamphlet).
3. Work Flow Monitoring System: use of activity data for work scheduling, planning, management purposes.

Financial Aid (in Annual Report)
1. narrative descriptions of impact of programs developed or in response to federal and state legialation or executive

These are the instructions and background material for a test run of the modest management information system being developed by the OSA Task Force on Research and Planning Information.

The purpose of the system is to routinely develop and report unit cost information on OSA services. We would like you to do your best at providing the information requested on the accompanying forms using the data you have at hand. We recognize that some of the information may be initially difficult to develop or ultimately that some of it may prove inappropriate. Most things of this sort require a considerable amount of adjustment and revision on the basis of experience before they work well. In return for your efforts on this pilot test, the Task Force will give you feedback on what we learned from it.

To get to unit cost information, there are three basic steps.

-- Specifying functions
-- Assembling budget or expenditure data
-- Specifying activity indicators

We have provided some background material for each of these steps.

Specifying Functions

Ideally, a system will assign costs to functions rather than departments. Functional breakdowns ultimately enhance comparisons both within university and between universities. We would like you to try assigning costs to functions on this test run. Doing so will test both the planning system and your lists of functions. Please complete one Planning Information Report for each function in your area.

We have attached (Attachment 1) the list of functions you developed in earlier planning efforts. Please feel free to use those or any other functional breakdown you want.

We know that assigning costs to some functions may be difficult. While the functional approach has advantages, the logic of the information system doesn't depend on it. OSA could develop a system which reports unit cost information by department if the functional breakdown ultimately seems unworkable. The logic of relating inputs to outputs remains the same regardless of whether the breakdown is by function or department.

Assembling Financial Data

In completing the planning report form, please use budget data as the basic source. Expenditure data often work better for this purpose, but they are somewhat harder to assemble.

The form asks you to compute FTE's for each function. If you do not have separate line items for staff, you may need to estimate FTE's using average salary data for various position (See Attachment 2). Additionally, where a staff member has several functions, you may need to estimate what percentage of that person's time is contributed to a given function.

The form also asks for data on fringe benefits, information which we think can be useful in several ways. Since fringe benefits are often not computed, Attachment 3 lists some formulas for doing so.

Activity Indicators

We have developed a list of activity indicators that we regard as most likely to be used in Student Affairs. For each function we would like you to provide data on one or more of the activity indicators. Please limit the activity indicators to three. Also please describe the indicator(s) you use so that we know exactly what you are counting.

If you have questions about the procedure, call Tim Delmont (6-5374) or Ron Matross (3-4862).

MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Office for Student Affairs - University of Minnesota

ACTIVITIES AREA

1. Student organization development
2. Student organization service
3. CAPP
4. Religious affairs coordination
5. ISTC
6. Legal service (to individuals)
7. Law related education
8. Intramurals
9. Sports clubs
10. Rec sports - self fitness
11. Minnesota union activities
12. Minnesota union service
13. Minnesota union human resource development
14. Minnesota union facilities

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

1. Career counseling
2. Academic skills counseling
3. Personal counseling
4. General information
5. Advise and assist international students
6. Advise and assist women
7. Advise and assist students with disabilities
8. Monitoring and resolution of student disciplinary cases
9. Education and training of graduate students and interns
10. Participation in the academic teaching program
11. Conducting research
12. Administration of tests and scoring of exams
13. Provide assistance to college student personnel offices
14. Provide assistance to faculty and administrators
15. Development and presentation of non-credit educational programs

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

1. Provide information to prospective students about the University, admissions and financial aid
2. Provide information and services to other educational institutions to facilitate admission and transfer
3. Receive and process applications
4. Provide orientation to new students
5. Register all students in appropriate colleges each term and assess tuition and fees
6. Establish and maintain academic records for all matriculated students

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES (cont.)

7. Make financial aid awards and provide financial and budget counseling for students
8. Make residency decisions
9. Prepare and submit federal and state mandated institutional reports (HEGIS, MHECB, other)
10. Provide and interpret student enrollment and academic data
11. Collect and maintain approved course offering information, coordinate scheduling and disseminate course schedule information to students
12. Certify student academic accomplishment and student status
13. Coordinate student data collection, dissemination of student information, operational procedures and system development for all campuses

HEALTH SERVICES

1. General medical
2. Women's health
3. Mental health
4. Athletic medicine
5. Other medical specialties
6. Emergency services
7. Dental health
8. Public health
9. Health education
10. Environmental health and safety

MINORITY AND SPECIAL STUDENTS

1. Coordination and management
2. Recruitment and admissions
3. Academic services
4. Counseling
5. Research, tracking and evaluation
6. Community service
7. University services
8. Cultural activities
9. Summer institute
10. Fund raising

HOUSING

1. Residence hall operations
2. Residence hall student development
3. Off-campus listing services; landlord/client services; advising/data-gathering/information services
4. Off-campus mediation; service-negotiation/referral/information services
5. Off-campus relocation; service-negotiation/information services
6. Family housing - advising/consultation services
7. Faculty housing - operations/advisory/consultation services
8. Coordinate campus information/consultation services

VICE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

1. High ability student programs
2. Conduct studies of students and student life
3. Administer student affairs staff
4. Coordinate student affairs administration with collegiate and coordinate campus administration
5. Provide leadership within University councils (Regents, COG, CAO, etc.)
6. Interact and consult with student leaders, communities, legislature and foundations
7. Secure funding for priority needs in OSA
8. Develop and administer new programs prior to transfer to appropriate student affairs area
9. Participate in regional and national student affairs and educational groups and organizations

4/29/81

Please use the following average salaries as necessary in calculating FIE'S from unassigned instruction, miscellaneous funds, or unfilled positions.

Examples of 1980-81 Average Salaries by Position Classification Based on the Printed Budget[1,2]

Clerical Group	
Office assistant	$ 8,954
Sr. office assistant	10,103
Sr. office specialist	13,154
Office supervisor	15,642
Secretarial assistant	9,377
Secretary	10,668
Medical records typist	11,460
Senior secretary	12,212
Principal secretary	13,592
Executive secretary	15,583
Administrative secretary	16,463
Data Processing and Analysis Group	
Sr. data entry operator	10,830
Data entry supervisor	13,092
St. data entry supervisor	15,164
Data processing technician	12,030
Sr. data processing technician	13,838
Principal data processing technician	15,930
Data processing operator supervisor	19,508
Student Records Group	
A and R assistant	15,786
A and R associate	21,248
A and R officer	24,780
Inspectional Group	
Safety technician	15,680
Emergency and safety coordinator	19,956
Environmental health specialist	19,669
Sr. environmental health specialist	22,800
Sr. health physicist	22,462
Occupational safety/health specialist	17,787
Sr. occupational safety/health specialist	19,416
Residence Hall Management Group	
Resident hall director	15,701
Sr. residence hall director	17,951
Principal residence hall director	22,874

Student Personnel Service Group	
Psychometric assistant	12,249
Psychometrist	14,556
Degree program advisor	14,170
Jr. student personnel worker	14,816
Student personnel worker	16,230
Sr. student personnel worker	19,631
Principal student personnel worker	23,856
Instructional and Research Staff	
Research associate	24,860
Research fellow	20,417
Research specialist	14,918
Teaching specialist	14,998
Student Academic Classes	
Teaching associate I	12,816
Teaching associate II	13,644
Teaching assistant	11,448
Undergraduate teaching assistant	6,701
Research assistant	10,910
Administrative fellow I	11,444
Administrative fellow II	12,821
Project assistant	11,450

[1]Salaries are for 12 month appointments on 0100 funds except for student academic and instructional and research classes which are 9 month and 12 month appointments combined on all funds.

[2]Data prepared from University Business Office Reports:

U of M Academic Salary Analysis—All Funds, 1980-81

U of M General Operations and Maintenance Fund, Academic Salary Analysis/Civil Service Salary Analysis, 1980-81

Fringe Benefit Information[1] (Calculate only for those employed 75% or more time).

The Business Office does not calculate and allocate fringe benefits funds to department 0100 budgets at the beginning of the fiscal year; to the extent possible, it does do so for all other funds. To assist in accurately estimating FY81 0100 funds for OSA departments or coordinators' areas, please estimate the amount of fringe benefits on 0100 salaries by using the following fringe benefit percentages:

academic salary base	18.63%
civil service salary base	18.90%

[1] Multipliers supplied by University of Minnesota Office of Research Administration.

Comments on "State of the Art" Evaluation Procedures in Public Service Agencies

Introduction

To identify "state of the art" evaluation procedures in agencies outside of the University, five brief case studies were prepared for the OSA Task Force. These case studies highlighted unique aspects of planning and evaluation procedures developed by five agencies whose services closely paralleled those of OSA units. The agencies were 1) the Program Evaluation Resource Center, a research and evaluation office of the Hennepin County Mental Health Center; 2) the Community Planning Organization, a priviate referral and consulting agency; 3) the United Way of Minneapolis, an umbrella organization providing management services for 71 human services agencies in the Minneapolis area, 4) Family and Children's Service, a United Way agency responsible for family treatment and development programs; and 5) the Office of the Legislative Auditor, a legislatively funded unit conducting financial audits and program evaluations of state agencies.

Evaluation methods and procedures were identified through interviews with professional staff and reviews of documents prepared in these five agencies. The oral presentation to the OSA Task Force briefly described the functions of each agency, a major agency evaluation project, the project's strengths and weaknesses, and initial issues associated with project design and implementation. This report summarizes the oral presentation, suggesting implications for the development of OSA evaluation processes.

Characteristics of Evaluation Processes

Evaluation efforts by the five agencies predated those of OSA, most having been initiated by 1975. Data have been prepared chiefly to assess the outcomes and improve the effectiveness of agency services, usually in reaction to accountability and reporting requirements of state and federal government agencies, private funding institutions, citizen's advisory groups or agency executive officers. Evaluation data have also been developed for planning and budgeting purposes, though not necessarily initially nor consistently in all units.

Evaluation procedures have usually been introduced through demonstration projects and on a selective rather than comprehensive basis. The complexity of choices involved in selecting and developing evaluation systems, system costs, and the perceived sensitivity of professional staff to the purposes and use of evaluation data account for much of the reluctance to introduce evaluative methods in a comprehensive manner.

For the most part, start up costs have been born by foundations, the federal government, and other sources, rarely by the agencies themselves. Principal costs generally have been for salaries and expenses of consultants, appointed staff, and evaluation personnel. Substantial in-house costs, chiefly the time of agency managers, central staff, and professionals, while rarely formally documented have been considerable, staff participation in evaluation design having been the norm.

Agency managers and consultants have consistently advocated such involvement since continuing, positive results for agency professionals have been identified, those being: 1) wider understanding of agency programs; 2) commitment to program improvement and changes in deliver methods; 3) readiness to accept and use program evaluation data; 4) insight into management techniques and needs; 5) improved in-house communication and information gathering procedures; and 6) in general, perceptible increases in staff morale.

Evaluation Methods

Varying evaluation methods and measures have been developed in the sample agencies, emphasis generally having been placed on program and goal-related evaluation techniques. The blanket application of a single method or measure across units having multiple functions has been rare. The attempt, for example, to implement a comprehensive program evaluation system in six human service agencies served by the Community Planning Organization met skepticism and resistance from agency professionals and CPO staff members, leading ultimately to the model's uneven application in those units.

Some examples of evaluation methods potentially applicable to OSA units follow: The goal attainment scaling technique, created by Dr. Thomas Kiresuk and his colleagues in the Program Evaluation Resource Center, is a widely recognized clinical outcomes instrument useful for specifying and measuring client behavior changes in mental health programs. Use of the goal attainment method has often led researchers and practicing professionals to assess staff and program goals more thoroughly, introducing "planned change" and standardized outcome assessment techniques in agency services.

Efforts at structured program analysis have been common. Many privately funded agencies have conducted multi-year evaluations, emphasizing especially the preparation of mission and goal statements, client descriptions and sets of program objectives/measures/expectancy levels. Moreover, the Office of the Legislative Auditor has assessed the performance of selected state agencies by determining the degree of compliance with state regulations, contracts, legislative intent, and established financial practices, offering recommendations for improvements in agency services.

Data Measures

A mix of data measures and indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, have been developed in these and other evaluation processes. As with OSA units, program descriptions have been commonly prepared, i.e., statements of program goals and objectives, listings of services, staff activity analysis or financially related data. Much information about clientele has also been gathered. Extensive demographic data have been collected in intake, process, and case closure surveys. Clientele needs assessments have also been prepared, emphasis having been placed often on needs identification by clinical practitioners and neighborhood or community social action groups. Professional marketing surveys, however, have rarely been used.

Program outcome data have included output measures and inpact indicators. For the most part, these indicators have been simple in concept, designed especially to meet selected reporting requirements or program needs, jointly developed by staff and managers, and most frequently both quantitative and qualitative in nature.

The output measures have tended to be numbers of clients, cases or units of activities produced; much emphasis has also been placed on the preparation of unit cost data. On the other hand, impact indicators have regularly included client satisfaction follow-up surveys, self and practitioner assessments of individual behavior changes, and intricate program analysis, especially through cost/benefits analysis procedures.

The frequency of data collection has related typically to reporting requirements and perceived administrative needs at both central and operating levels. The preparation of trend data, gathered through case study or survey procedures, has been preferred. Information has been prepared manually, but computer systems have been introduced where evaluation has been perceived as an ongoing line administrative function.

Uses of Evaluation Data

Because the sample agencies have been developing evaluation methods and measures over a three to five year period, evaluation data appear to have been used for both summative and formative purposes. In general, the privately funded agencies have stressed the use of evaluation data for reporting purposes, that is, to provide a snapshot view of agency effectiveness for senior decision makers -- agency officers often sensitive to the demand for accountability reports from foundations, donors, and organized clientele groups. At least one private agency, FCS, has also used evaluation data for planning, budgeting, and program development purposes.

The public agencies, the Program Evaluation Resource Center and the Office of the Legislative Auditor, have routinely developed evaluation data to inform decision making about personnel and budgeting matters as well as for purposes of program improvement and change. The high visibility and continuing need for scrutiny of many public programs has probably demanded as much.

Personnel interviewed in the five agencies see competition for resources and, subsequently, program-related reporting requirements and demands for accountability increasing in the 1980's. Most believe that the establishment of ongoing evaluation methods is an inevitability. The United Way of Minneapolis, for example, has moved from a demonstration to developmental phase in its evaluation processes. Policies and principals for a broadly based, participatively developed system, emphasizing a programmatic format but multiple data measures, are being developed presently with implementation expected in spring, 1981. Moreover, the two public agencies will continue to apply programmatic and "utilization-focused" assessments where directed or asked. No cutbacks in legislative or, in the case of the Program Evaluation Resource Center, NIMH funding are anticipated.

Evaluation Issues

In developing evaluation processess, the sample agencies have dealt with and, for the most part, resolved complex issues. Many of these issues are similar to ones confronting OSA units. They will be highlighted in the following paragraphs.

1. Judgments about real data needs have to be made, recognizing that information demands, program services, and agency managers and staffs can be expected to change. As a group, the outside agencies have identified multiple purposes for data collection, preferring also multiple uses for data measures.
2. The readiness and "education" of agency professionals to evaluation processes has been a concern of agency leaders. Evaluation and accountability efforts often carry a negative connotation for many professionals. The views of one caseworker quoted by Dr. Kiresuk are not uncommon: "The principal effect of evaluation is not to stimulate good performance but to frighten professionals." A frequent answer has been to emphasize broadly based staff participation, on the one hand, and display executive-level interest and commitment, on the other.
3. A related issue has been the unambigous definition of roles for trustees, agency managers, central staff, consultants, etc., in the design and implementation of evaluation systems. In this matter the outside agencies have stressed inclusive, continuing roles for major participants. The frustrations of coping with "political" and professional haggling resulting from the use of these participative and consensual procedures have been tolerated.
4. The costs of introducing evaluation systems and especially of developing outcomes information have been substantial. For the most part, start-up costs have been met by outside sources; on-going costs have been or will be assumed by the agencies themselves.
5. The development of comprehensive vs limited approaches to evaluation has also been a major concern. Most frequently the latter has been preferred, the use of sampling procedures having been especially favored.
6. Data interpretion has been a challenge in evaluation processes. In the sample agencies, praticing professionals, assisted by consultants or central staff, most frequently carry responsibility for this function. In this way, confusion over standards, norms, criteria, etc., has not necessarily lessened, but staff morale has improved.

1/22/81

A Selected Review of Evaluation Approaches in Student Affairs

The literature on evaluation contains many different models and approaches. This review concentrates on three approaches that have been the most prominent in the small but growing literature on evaluation in student affairs. The discussion of each approach includes a brief description of its rationale, a description of the major technologies or instruments used in the approach, an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the approach, and a listing of some key references, names, and innovative institutions connected with the approach.

The Student Development Approach

An examination of the recent literature in student personnel quickly reveals that student development is the dominant theoretical concept in the field. The recent emphasis on development is actually a continuation of the long-standing Dewey-inspired tradition of focusing on education of the "whole person," an approach that was the heart of E.G. Williamson's "student personnel point of view." What is new in the recent work in this area is the explicit use of concepts and measurement techniques derived from current developmental theories, particularly those of Kohlberg, Perry, and Loevinger.

The developmental approach to evaluation in student affairs programs starts with the premise that student affairs programs need to be assessed in terms of their contribution to the overall mission of enhancing student development (i.e. "educating the whole person"). Student development is defined as "the application of human development concepts in post-secondary settings so that all those involved can master increasingly complex developmental tasks, achieve self-direction, and become interdependent" (Miller and Prince, 1976, p. 3). From this point of view the job of evaluation is to determine how well development is being enhanced, a question that demands data on measured outcomes.

"Efforts to design programs responsive to the developmental needs of students must show that they will make a difference....Such evaluation calls for more than the use of rating forms to discover participants' satisfaction with a program and more than simple reports of numbers served and subjective statements about staff abilities. These data alone are inadequate as bases for deciding to modify or curtail existing programs or inaugurate new ones" (Miller and Prince, 1976, p. 134-5).

Clearly the best framework for a developmental evaluation is that of the classic experimental design, or at least a quasi-experimental design. The developmental level of individuals on a dimension is assessed before and after a relevant program or intervention, and the program's effects are measured in terms of the average or proportion of those who become more advanced developmentally. While programmatic decisions are based on outcome data, there are no definitive decision rules for making judgments applicable across situations (e.g. 75% must improve one stage in moral development).

Technologies

Because human development proceeds along several different dimensions, there is no single measure of developmental progress to be used in an evaluation. Different measures are needed depending on which aspect of development is the focus of the program. Usually the most rigorous of such measures are those that have been associated with a major developmental theory: in moral development, Kohlberg's structured interview, and Rests' Defining Issues Test; in personality development, Loevinger's sentence completion test; in cognitive development, Perry's scale of reflective judgment. These are at their best when an intervention is specifically targeted toward the dimension which they measure (e.g. moral issues discussions). They become less useful when interventions are more diffuse

(e.g. personal counseling). This is because of the problem of "magnitude of effect." A general, real-life intervention may not have much of an effect on the particular dimensions being measured, despite the fact that it may be quite helpful in other ways.

The magnitude of effect problem is a limiting factor on many other instruments that might also be applied in the developmental approach, including many different personality inventories (MMPI, POI, CIP, etc.) and attitude scales (dogmatism, I/E, etc.). Changes in these measures are obtainable in research studies where interventions are powerful, and cleanly targeted, but are hard to obtain when interventions consist of ongoing services. Combined with the expense and difficulty of administering these instruments, it is not surprising that the literature contains few actual reports of the use of these instruments to evaluate ongoing, real-life services.

Aware of these problems, developmental proponents have been looking at alternative measurement methods. Two of these alternatives seem promising for evaluation purposes:

Student Development Transcripts. Robert Brown at Nebraska-Lincoln (Brown & Citrin, 1977) has been working on the idea of a student development transcript, a cumulative record of developmentally-oriented experiences and achievements, to be kept by and on a student in a manner somewhat analogous to a conventional academic transcript. Brown suggests three formats for such a transcript. The first is an experiential checklist, an inventory of experiences that are planned to promote the student's development in a particular area. It is assumed that if a person has an experience (course, workshop, internship, or whatever) intended to enhance development in an area, then something developmentally useful will have happened. Of course, this is not true outcome measurement, but it is no worse than assuming that a student has learned something useful simply because he or

she took a particular course in a subject. The cumulative index of experiences summed across participants becomes something of an outcome measure.

The second format is that of a competency-based checklist. This is a checklist of behavioral cognitive competencies assessed by an observer, (e.g. Has demonstrated listening skills). Usually these checklists are developed in a behavioral contract procedure where the student commits himself or herself to particular competency goals. Krumboltz (1974) has written a useful article on how this model can be used as an accountability model for counselors. (The reader should note the compatibility of this approach with Goal Attainment Scaling).

The third format for the student development transcript is the portfolio. In the portfolio approach, the student and adviser compile a "variety of testimonial products, experience records, and other items that portray what he or she has been doing. Research papers, art products, list of activities, and other items may leave the evaluation up to a reviewer or may simply testify to the kind and variety of activity and not of the quality" (Brown, 1977, p. 167). The portfolio approach has been used extensively in innovative curricula, most notably at Empire State College, but also Manhattanville, Wisconsin--Green Bay, and Metropolitan State in the Twin Cities. Usually portfolios are used in conjunction with the other two formats when they have been used in experimental education. While promising, the student development transcript approach is still experimental and has not been well refined. It suffers some of the same practical problems of expense, difficulty, and complexity. It seems to have been most successful in experimental education programs, where the whole college is structured around it as an evaluation tool. The Empire State system is the most developed and refined of such systems.

Competency Assessment. Harvard psychologist David McClelland and colleagues have begun a potentially revolutionary movement in the area of performance testing, the Competency Assessment Movement. They are working on competency measures

in a wide range of activities related to education, industry and the military. They believe that the measures are much better targeted and much more meaningful than traditional performance measures. As described by McClelland and Boyatzis (1980), the development of measures involves the following steps: 1. Locate some outstanding and average performers in a field. 2. Conduct behavioral-event interviews of a small sample of outstanding and average performances. (Develop material on specifics of how they did their work and solved problems.) 3. Conceptualize the competencies that differentiate superior from average performers. (Competency is defined as a generic body of knowledge, motives, traits, self-images, social roles, and skills that are causally related to superior or effective performance on the job.) 4. Find or develop measures for the competencies that differentiate superior from average performers. (May be existing instruments or coding systems for observer scoring of persons on these competencies.) 5. Administer the tests supposedly measuring the competencies to a new group of individuals rated for success to see if the tests differentiate the more from the less successful.

Although the competency assessment movement is now primarily concerned with vocational performance (through a private firm McBer and Company), it gained its momentum from an important study of the competencies of liberal arts graduates (cf. Winter, McClelland, and Stewart, 1980). This study developed and tested measures of previously ineffable and impalpable outcomes thought to be associated with a liberal arts education. The potential of the application of the thematic analysis approach developed in this study to the equally hard-to-measure outcomes of student affairs is considerable.

<u>Advantages of the Student Development Approach</u>

— Theory base

— True outcome measurement

— Leads to creative thinking and innovation in program design

— Particularly applicable to experimental programs

— Particularly applicable to intense or long term interactions (e.g. student counseling and student leadership consulting.

Disadvantages of the Student Development Approach

— Expensive

— Complicated

— Obtuse

— Not applicable to less intense services (e.g. handing out bulletins)

— Hard to apply to complex interventions (magnitude of effects problems)

Key References, Persons, and Institutions

Theory: Clyde Parker, U of M. See Knefelkamp, Widick, & Parker (Eds.), Applying new developmental findings. New Directions for Student Services, No. 4, 1978, Jossey Bass. Also chapter by same authors in Delworth, Hanson & Associates, Student Services, a Handbook for the Profession, Jossey Bass, 1980.

Miller & Prince, The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1976.

Student Development Transcripts: Key Person--Robert Brown. Nebraska-Lincoln. Brown, R.D. & Citrin, R.S. A student development transcript: Assumptions, uses, and formats. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1977, 18, 163-168.

Also see chapter by Brown in the Delworth and Hanson volume.

Krumboltz, J.D. An accountability model for counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52, June, 1974.

Key Institutions: Empire State, Wisconsin-Green Bay, Metropolitan State, Nebraska-Lincoln.

Competency Testing: Key Person: David McClelland. Key Place: Harvard. McClelland & Boyatzis, Opportunities for counselors from the competency assessment movement. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 58, pp. 368-372, Jan. 1980.

Winter, D.G., McClelland, D.C., & Stewart, A.J. Competence in College: Evaluating the liberal university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

The Management Approach to Evaluation in Student Affairs

The management approach to evaluation in student affairs is the application of what has come to be known as the tradition or goal-oriented evaluation approach, familiar to all students of the evaluation enterprise. Harpel (1978, pp. 19-20) distinguishes it from the more esoteric developmental approach as follows: "Evaluation from a management standpoint....does not focus on the question of effectiveness alone or on testing theories of development but on measuring outcomes relative to the resources and purposes of the college or university at large. Since managers must channel resources and activities to produce a desired outcome, evaluation that meets their needs considers both effectiveness and efficiency. In other words, it relates outcomes to the achievement of objectiveness as well as to the resources required to operate the program--the budget." Harpel outlines the following steps in applying the management model to student affairs:

Step 1. Identify the problem (assess needs). The objective in this phase is to produce a profile of the va ous needs of the student, sometimes obtained through standardized inventories available from ETS and ACT.

Step 2. Assess constraints. In this phase managers assess the constraints on their ability to program for student needs, including social constraints (attitudes, tradition), economic constraints (budget, funding sources), political constraints (attitudes toward student services in institution and legislature), legal constraints (e.g. Buckley amendment, privacy laws, etc.).

Step 3. State goals. In this phase programmatic goals are set forth in a general way. Set general, but measurable, directions for programs.

Step 4. Define objectives. Objectives are short-range, time-limited targets, with measurable outcomes.

Step 5. Define program structure. Programs are developed and organized along functional lines; that is, they are grouped in terms of how they relate to objectives and goal-statements.

Step 6. Budgeting. Once programs are defined, they are related to costs through a program budgeting system. Theoretically, the costs of meeting various objectives can be assigned.

Step 7. Assess outcomes. Outcomes are measured in terms of attainment of objectives and the cost/effectiveness of alternative ways for obtaining objectives. Theoretically, any applicable outcome measure can be used in this analysis, although in practice, most such systems settle for output or volume measures (e.g. put on career development workshop for 30 people).

Technologies. As mentioned above, virtually any relevant measure can be built into a management-oriented evaluation system. That is, the manager can develop explicit decision rules (e.g., We will initiate a program if 75% of those in a random survey rank career information as very important). Or we will terminate a program if fewer than 60% change their scores 1 s.d. on the CPI responsibility scale. In point of fact, actual practice seems to rely most on two technologies borrowed from business: Management by Objectives (MBO) and Program Budgeting (PPBS) involve the setting of objectives by individual staff for their performance, coordinated with program objectives, in turn coordinated with organizational goals. PPBS involves assigning costs to individual programs and monitoring actual costs, and when used with MBO, assigning costs to the attainment of specific objectives.

The University of Minnesota was one of the leaders of initiating MBO and PPBS in student affairs, in the early 1970's. Whether the problem was with the system or with the implementation, the effort quickly died and only vestiges remain in the Minnesota Union. Staff resistance to the idea was considerable (insulting to professionals, mickey-mouse, too much paperwork were the common complaints). More fundamentally, credibility was a problem. People did not believe that ultimately the old ways of budgeting would really change. They

thought the system was mainly whiz-bang window dressing. Also the system was out of touch with the budgeting process of the rest of the University, particularly the academic units. While there were no doubt local factors involved, other university applications have had similar experiences. One difficulty is with the whole idea of setting goals for ongoing service. Setting goals for new services is a great idea, but it's less applicable to clearly defined services that have a long history. For these services, Jim Preus' notion of level of service, rather than goals, has much appeal.

Furthermore, the constraints listed by Harpel often mitigate against the application of the full-blown classical model, in which traditional organizational structures are rearranged along functional lines, according to an assessment of student needs. The University of Minnesota was also a leader in developing plans for the functional reorganization of services, based on needs sensing. The report from this project, the OSA Systems Design Project, circa 1973, is now gathering dust. The suggested design was creative and innovative, but it had little ultimate impact because of strong adherence to traditional organizational structures.

One still finds articles and books in the student personnel literature (e.g. Foxley, 1980), portraying MBO, PPBS, and systems design as exciting new innovations, and they may be, but their implementation at large universities is tricky. In its own way, the classic management approach to evaluation is every bit as Utopian and pie-in-the-sky as the developmental approach.

Utilization-based Evaluation. However, the classic "set goals--implement programs--evaluate progress" model does not have to be applied in its full-blown form. There are citations in the literature of interesting and practical modifications of the approach to meet the needs of individual institutions and individual decision makers. As Cronbach (1980) makes clear, the field of program evaluation is moving toward a renewed and more intense understanding of the

particular needs of the individual decision maker. The utilization-based evaluation approach of Patton (1978) is an example of how the management approach can be modified into a more practical form. This approach begins with a thorough diagnosis of who will use evaluation information, for what purposes, and what will be considered credible. Once these things are understood, evaluators and program personnel work together to determine a methodology appropriate to the problem. Credibility and the decisions to be made are given precedence over methodological purity or theory. Patton has had some notable success with this approach in evaluating social programs. When they have succeeded, some of the polling efforts by Student Life Studies have fallen into this category because they were tailored to individual decisions (we won't discuss the failures here)!

Practioners of the utilization-based approach are hard to find in the literature because by definition their methods are so local that they are not widely disseminated. Two that did turn up are the use of a somewhat uniform system for keeping track of student contacts using optical scan forms for quick turnaround at the University of Colorado, and a system of on-the-spot satisfaction surveys of consumers of various services at Northern Illinois. Other innovators in the utilization approach are undoubtedly in other student affairs offices.

It should be noted that a utilization-based approach runs a risk of catering to the idiosyncratic whims of a given decision-maker. If the decision-maker is malevolent or not too bright, then there can be problems! Additionally, compared to more theoretical approaches, the utilization-based approach can perpetuate the status quo and not encourage innovation.

<u>Advantages of Management Models</u> (Utilization-Based)

-- Practical

-- Tuned to real needs

— Cost/effective

— "Plays in Peoria"

Disadvantages of Management Models

— Dumb decision-makers

-- Perpetuates status quo

-- Irrelevant (Classic models)

Key References, Persons, and Institutions

MBO/PPBS: Cecilia Foxley, Iowa.
Richard Harpel, University of Colorado.

See C.H. Foxley (Ed.), New Directions for Student Services: Applying Management Techniques, No. 9. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980. Also see Johnson & Foxley in the Delworth & Hanson volume.

Harpel, R. Evaluating programs from a management perspective. In G.R. Hanson (Ed.), New Directions for Student Services, No. 1--Evaluating Program Effectiveness, Jossey-Bass, Spring, 1978. Also see chapter in the Delworth & Hanson volume.

Utilization-Based Evaluation: L. Cronbach and Associates. Reforming Program Evaluation, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Patton, M.Q. Utilization-Based Evaluation, Sage , 1978.

The Self-Study Approach to Evaluation in Student Affairs

The third approach, outlined by C. Robert Pace, is the self-study approach. Pace (1978, p. 15) defines it thusly: "College self-study....can be almost anything a group wants to study on the college; it need not be a total review of institutional purposes and programs. Its main distinguishing feature is that it is designed, conducted, and interpreted internally, not by an external evaluation. This characteristic at least offers the potential for making evaluation a learning activity for those who engage in it....A successful self-study model requires several ingredients. The topic or focus of the study must be recognized as important. The people most directly concerned about it and most likely to be affected by the results must be active in carrying out the study.

Maintaining active participation requires continuous and open communication, discussion and debate. The interpretation of results reflect consensus. And finally, plans must be made and followed for translating the conclusions into appropriate actions."

The self-study approach is definitely very broad and more than a little ambiguous. It merges into the utilization-based approach. However, most traditional program reviews in academic can be included in this category. That is, most academic reviews concentrate on opinions and process. Attempts are made to gain a wide range of opinions about program quality from participants, staff, service recipients, students, administrators, and scholars. Objective output and outcome data are often used in the process, but primary emphasis is given to interpretations of the data by various parties. Although it is stretching the definition of "self" somewhat, evaluation teams in the same discipline from other universities are often used in conjunction with reviews by department members. Sometimes internal evaluation experts are used either to provide data or to serve as consultants. Still, the emphasis is on process.

A recent Hi-Tech variation of the self-study approach is the eco-system approach, which is loosely based on concepts from environmental psychology (cf. Huebner, 1980, and Banning, 1980). The ecosystem approach fits here because it primarily emphasizes varying perceptions of the campus environment and a process of discussing these perceptions in a self-study process emphasizing directions for change.

Technologies

Any number of assessment techniques can be used in a self-study approach. However, the majority of those used can be classed as perceptual measures--ways of assessing different peoples' perceptions or views of an issue or a program (cf. Pinsky & Ebbes, 1980). The best-known perceptual measures are general

standardized instruments for viewing the college environment, the CUES (College and University Environment Scales and the College Characteristics Index (CCI). Although these instruments have been widely used, they have also been widely criticized as being too general for specific decision making (Centra & Linn, 1970, Baird, L.L. & Hartnett, R.T., 1980). For example, if one wishes to know whether students think a college union is a pleasant place, the general questions about the atmosphere of the institution from the CUES or CCI are not very useful.

The general environmental perception instruments seem most useful for comparing subgroups of students (e.g., Do commuter students or minority students or foreign students think the college is a less hospitable place than do other students?) More specific perceptual information is usually gathered through a locally-developed, custom-tailored instrument (polls, surveys, etc.). While often extremely useful because of their obvious relevance, these instruments do not permit inter-institutional comparisons. Thus, some of the more fundamental questions about how a college compares with other similar institutions cannot be answered.

A recent development is the attempt by the major testing companies, ACT and ETS, to balance off the need for specific local program information and the need for inter-institutional comparisons. They are doing so by providing a series of standardized instruments for looking at student and faculty views of concrete aspects of campus life and support services (e.g., satisfaction with health services) in a way that is more targeted than the general environmental measures. They are also developing item catalogs from which a college may select relevant items. Although these services are just beginning, their growth and potential utility should be watched.

Innovations in Process

It should be remembered that the self-study method emphasizes the process of self-examination as much as the results. Despite talking about their work in

terms of Jerry-Brown rhetoric about ecosystems and eco-mapping, the campus ecology theorists (cf Huebner, Banning, Aulepp, Delworth, Corrizini) have practiced some interesting ways of developing and using data in self-study efforts. One of the tools devised in this effort is the Environmental Satisfaction Questionnaire (Corazzini, Wilson, & Huebner, 1977), which consists of two parts. The first part has students agree or disagree with various statements about campus life, much like the CUES and other similar perceptual instruments. However, the second part has students go beyond this and asks them to list particular aspects of the environment which have caused this problem and what might be done to change things. Data from this and other measures is processed by a staff group environmental assessment team, which makes suggestions about innovations in services. A program to remedy the problem is then developed and pilot tested. Corrizini (1980) cites a case of the usage of this procedure to identify and remedy a problem of poor faculty advising at Colorado State University. Another interesting approach is to appoint panels of students to keep logs of experiences and to identify problems with the environment that appeared in the logs. This material then is discussed by a committee to "brainstorm" ideas for change. This technique has been useful in helping student governments develop worthwhile ideas to promote. In the ecology point of view, evaluators act as consultants not only on the gathering of data but also on the use of the data in developing plans for change. Such programs have occurred at Arizona State, Indiana, and Colorado State.

More traditional self-study approaches involving peer review either by others in the field or an advisory committee are also used. Kerr (1980) talks about the use of such techniques at California-Davis. A schedule is set for the evaluation of a student service, much like that of academic departments at other institutions. Penn State is also reputed to use such a system.

The self-study approach either in its traditional or new forms is rather amorphous and malleable. This is both a strength and a weakness. The strength is that the approach is flexible and adaptable. This allows it to meet the needs of decision makers and program participants. The approach has a built-in press for consensus and commitment. The weakness is that the formlessness makes the approach susceptible to political manipulation. Those who wish to put together a "window dressing" evaluation committee or a shallow survey to keep from looking too deeply at the question of effectiveness. Savvy staff can effectively control the self-study process to preserve the status quo.

Advantages of the Self Study Approach

— Flexible/adaptable

— Involves staff

— Often inexpensive

— Encourages consensus

— Encourages commitment

-- Encourages creativity

-- Comparable with traditions

Disadvantages of the Self Study Approach

— Ambiguous

— Susceptible to politics

— Utopian (ecosystem approach)

— Can perpetuate status quo

Key Persons, References, and Institutions

Persons: Pace, Huebner, Banning, Baird, Brown, Kerry, Keating, Hurst.

Institutions: Arizona State, Indiana, Iowa, California-Davis, Colorado State, Texas

References: Huebner, L.A. (Ed.), Redesigning Campus Environments--New Directions, No. 8, 1979.

Keating, L. & Hurst, J. The Evaluator as Consultant. In New Directions, No. 1, 1978.

Kerr, Evaluating Services. In Delworth & Hanson, 1980.

Banning, I.H. The Campus Ecology Manager Role. In Delworth & Hanson, 1980.

Huebner, L.A. Interaction of Student and Campus. In Delworth & Hanson, 1980.

Baird, L.L., & Hartnett, R.T. Understanding Student and Faculty Life. Using Campus Surveys to Improve/Academia Decision Making. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980.

Coda

I will not try, at this point, to synthesize how we might draw from the three approaches, except to note that each approach primarily focuses on one of the data types in our model:

Developmental Approach: Measured outcome data.

Managerial Approach: Output/volume data.

Self-Study Approach: Perceived needs and perceived outcomes.

Examples of Level of Service Analyses for OSA Units

EXAMPLE 1: OFFICE OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

The range of services provided is confounded with the level at which each of those services is provided. Example: OSFA might develop a program of educational seminars on personal finances for all students if resources were available -- but doing so (within present resources) would detract from levels of service provided in ongoing aid programs.

Consider the various programs of the office (e.g. interaction with prospective students, preparing and adjusting packages, student contact services, academic progress review, GSL processing). For each you can probably define 1) the minimal level which is required to participate, 2) a (theoretical) high quality service (unconstrained by resource considerations, 3) one or more steps in between, and 4) where OSFA falls in the level of service in terms of what is provided now. A matrix results, eg:

	Program A	Program B	.....	Program X
HI QUALITY	Description	Description		Description
OSFA	Description			OSFA Description
		Description		Description
	Description			Description
				Description
MINIMAL SERVICE	Description	Description	OSFA	Description

No one outside OSFA can construct this matrix. But this can become a vehicle for communicating with those outside OSFA. Those outside the financial aid community should be dealing with questions of the level of service which should be provided at the University of Minnesota.

In an ideal world, resource implications of moves up and down in level of service for each program could be identified. That may be a necessary later step in the process, but do not spend the time to do so now. Of course, you may have ready information about the cost of moves, and it would be valuable.

PROGRAM 1A - GSL COUNSELOR INTERVIEW

Quality of Service Options		
	Highest Quality	Process applications on the spot. Spend extensive time with individual students checking correctness of form, exploring financial aid options, discussing factors to be considered with regard to loan indebtedness, and helping student find most advantageous lender for the student. Brief waiting time for student applicants. Counselor available 8 AM to 6 PM and two nights per week. Counselors maintain updated handbook on policies and procedures and maintain good communication with lenders and insuring agencies.
	High Quality OSFA X	Process applications on the spot. Spend adequate time with students reviewing basic application components and aid options. Briefly list possible lenders. Waiting time varies - may be lengthy on busy days. Students may need to return another day. Counselors available six hours per day. Periodic training sessions are provided to update counselors on policies.
	Low Quality	Application accepted over counter and not returned to student immediately as in options A and B. Application quickly reviewed at counter for completeness. Forms completed by counselor and returned by mail to student in two weeks, if there are no problems noticed by staff. Correspondence with students done by mail.
	Minimal Quality	Applications accepted over counter or by mail. Assume students have filled out form correctly. If they have not, require them to come into office to clear up any problems when they inquire about the status of their application. Counselors process forms when time is available. Students return to office to pick up completed applications.

PROGRAM 1B - GSL CLERICAL PROCESSING

Quality of Service Opt		
	Highest Quality	Clerical staff creates aid file and enters data on completed GSL applications on the same day counselor completes the application. Staff calls lenders on behalf of students to monitor further process of their applications. Maintain an updated list of active lenders for staff and students. Respond promptly to inquiries from lenders regarding student enrollment and/or loan status. Answer telephone inquiries from students thoroughly as they come in to the office.
	Medium Quality OSFA X	Clerical staff creates aid file and enters data within a few days. Staff calls lenders upon student request to check on process of their application. Update list of lenders occasionally. Return calls to lenders and students regarding individual loan status, enrollment, and eligibility requirements.
	Low Quality	Clerical staff create file and enter data when time is available. Staff refers students inquiring about their loans to the lenders. Do not maintain an active list of lenders.
	Minimal Quality	Create paper file as mandated by federal regulation but data processing is not maintained for students who do not have other financial aid. The staff is not accessible by telephone.

PROGRAM 1C - GSL CHECK DISTRIBUTION

	Highest Quality	Students are notified by Office of Student Financial Aid when a check is received and when it may be picked up. Students may come in anytime during normal office hours to pick up their check at the OSFA or the Bursar's office. Students who have State of Minnesota checks who must have an interview before they can pick up their funds may receive the interview at any time during the day from a professional staff member. If students do not pick up their checks, they are sent reminder notices. Checks not picked up are returned promptly to the lenders.
	Medium Quality OSFA X	Students may inquire whether their checks have been received as a check record is maintained. If they have a check from a bank, they may pick it up during normal office hours at the Bursar. If their check is a State of Minnesota check, they must come in on certain days to receive their interview with a professional staff member. During busy days they may have to wait in a lengthy line and the interview will be perfunctory. Students are sent reminder notices to pick up their check. Checks not picked up are returned to the lenders, sometimes after some delay.
	Minimal Quality	Students who wish to pick up checks must continue to check at the distribution points to see if their check is in the distribution box. Checks may only be picked up at designated times when there are few other checks to distribute. Interviews for State of Minnesota checks are given in large groups once a week. Students are not reminded to pick up checks. Checks are returned to lenders when time is available.

PROGRAM 2 - COUNSELING-ADVISING - 2A WALK-IN COUNSELING

Highest Quality — Walk in counselors are on duty 8 AM to 6 PM two or more nights per week. A student may come to the office any time during those hours and be assured of seeing someone who is familiar with their particular concern or type of financial aid problem. They would be seen in less than ½ hour. Walk - in counselors would be permanent employees familiar with program guidelines and the full range of financial alternatives and other university student services. Short term loans would be provided immediately for the convenience of the student in a pleasant manner.

Medium Quality — Walk in counselors are on duty for restricted portions of each day. Students who come are put on a waiting list which may be long. Students whose problem cannot be resolved in fifteen minutes are asked to make an appointment to return. Less than fully informed full-time staff and part time staff are sometimes used as walk in counselors. They may or may not be aware of all alternatives available for a particular student. Short term loans are restricted to meet specific emergencies and usually are not availalbe for a week. Demands on staff may be so heavy that staff occasionally become tired and short with students.

OSFA X

Minimal Quality — Walk in counselors are not available on a routine basis. Students must make an appointment or present their case forcefully enough to warrant special consideration. Short term loans are not available to assist students with emergency needs. All informational questions are answered by clerical staff.

PROGRAM 2 COUNSELING ADVISING 2B BUDGET&FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Highest Quality — Counselors are readily available to help students complete their budgets. They make cost saving suggestions, are able to explain to students such things as managing a checking account and income tax procedures. Extensive cost conscious consumer information brochures are available for distribution. Mini courses and budget management sessions are held on a regular basis for specific groups of students or students requesting assistance. Excellent application materials are available which give students specific hints and tips.

Medium Quality — Counseling staff is available on an appointment basis to assist Btudents with particular budget or financial problems. There maybe a two or three week waiting period before an appointment can be obtained. Staff are available to assist specific groups of students complete their applications (such as those with language difficulties). Application materials contain extensive information about procedures, policies, and sample budgets or fiscal items.

OSFA X

Minimal Quality — Staff is generally not available to meet with individual students to discuss budget or financial problems. Whatever information is disbursed is done in written form with the aid application packet. Clerical staff is not available to answer telephone inquiries about budgets or application instructions.

EXAMPLE 2

BOYNTON HEALTH SERVICE
MEDICAL TREATMENT
LEVELS OF SERVICE EVALUATION

Level 4 (Top Quality)	Appointment available same day for generalist within a week for in-house specialist. Appointments kept within half-an-hour. Initial intake include personal and family health history. Diagnostic testing and consultation performed. Diagnosis and treatment on-site. Follow-up visits by same provider (physician or nurse practitioner). Patient questions and concerns addressed to his/her satisfaction.
Level 3 (High Quality)	Appointments available same day for generalist, within week by referral for specialist; appointments kept within half hour. Symptomatic treatment, plus diagnostic testing (lab, x-ray). Diagnostic testing results reliable and available within 24 hours. Diagnosis and treatment by medical provider.
Level 2 (Middle Quality)	Appointment for generalist within one week, walk-in in E.R. only for same day service; within two months for specialist, appointment kept within one hour. Diagnostic testing, (results available within one week), diagnosis and treatment. Follow-up by other providers.
Level 1 (Minimum Quality)	Walk-in visits only; wait over one hour. Symptomatic care for minor illness and injury. No diagnostic testing nor diagnoses made.

STUDENT HEALTH SERVICE

Part E. ***Pertinent Background Data, Documents and Sample Opinion Polls***

(This is a listing of such items as policy references, procedural documents, organization charts, workload data and measurements, and performance indicators which will be helpful to the review team in conducting the appraisal.)

1. Schedule of health and safety inspections for the preceding year and the current year.
2. Copies of a selected sample of health and safety inspection reports with a description or other evidence of follow-up actions.
3. Reports on other phases of the campus health, safety and risk management program for the past three years.
4. Copies of reports of the State Fire Marshal, insurance companies and other external sources that evaluate the campus health and safety programs and practices with copies of campus responses and follow-up actions.

Sample Opinion Polls

A departmental questionnaire developed by the Riverside campus of the University of California is included.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & SAFETY
QUESTIONNAIRE
(Department Head)

1. What is your understanding of the role of Health and Safety on this campus? Based upon your understanding, do you feel the job is being done? If not, what would you recommend?
2. What type and frequency of contacts, if any, have you had with the Environmental Health and Safety Office at UCR, particularly during the last 2 years?
3. If there were interactions with Environmental Health and Safety in that time period, to what extent and in what way were they satisfactory or unsatisfactory? Please be as explicit and detailed as possible.
4. If a possible hazard within your department came to your attention, what, if anything, would you expect Environmental Health and Safety to do about it? Please explain your expectations in sufficient detail to enable the Team to judge if Environmental Health and Safety is meeting, or able to meet, your expectations.
5. What services, other than those discussed above, do you expect Environmental Health and Safety to fulfill now or in the future, as need arises?
6. Do you feel Health and Safety should have strictly an advisory role in your departmental operations?
7. Would your department support a Health and Safety staff that was empowered to shut down an operating hazard, procedure or laboratory in your department?
8. What do you and your staff feel you would need, if anything, to be adequately versed in:
   a. Health and Safety Procedures (e.g., fire, first aid, defensive driving, etc.)?
   b. State and Federal safety regulations (e.g., OSHA)?
9. Do you feel that the most hazardous aspects of the work of your department have been identified?
   a. How were they identified?
   b. Do you feel that you receive adequate support from Environmental Health and Safety in dealing with those conditions? Please elaborate.
10. Who, in your opinion, is responsible for maintaining a safe working environment in your department?
11. Do you have an individual or a group that is responsible for health and safety within your department?
    a. If not, do you think you should? Please elaborate.
    b. If you do, how is it organized?
    c. What are its functions?

Please feel free to attach additional sheets for the inclusion of other comments or observations you may wish to make.

From: Appraising Administrative Operations: A Guide for Universities and Colleges, California University Systemwide Administration, 1976, p. 127-8; 166-9.

Part E. *Pertinent Background Data, Documents and Sample Opinion Polls*

(This is a listing of such items as policy references, procedural documents, workload data and activity measurements which will be helpful to the review team in conducting its appraisal. These are in addition to the items listed in Part E. of the *General Management* Guidelines section.)

Background Data and Documents

The following documents and publications are suggested to provide the review team with substantial background information on the national development of student financial aid, aid program policies and regulations, and campus operational data.

Publications

- —current need analysis guides published by The American College Testing Program (Iowa City) and the College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Examination Board (New York).
- —*An Annotated Bibliography in Student Financial Aid*. The American College Testing Program, Iowa City, latest edition (reference document).
- —pertinent current issues of:
  - *Federal Register*
  - *Chronicle of Higher Education*
  - *Journal of Student Financial Aid* (published by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators)
- —current Congressional amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (e.g., Public Law 92-318, 92nd Congress, S. 659, 6/23/72).
- —Department of Health, Education and Welfare manuals for federal aid programs (latest editions and as applicable to local aid programs).

Campus Documents

- —latest institutional application for federal aid funds
- —Financial Aid Office procedural documentation
- —Financial Aid Office flow process charts
- —budget proposals of units involved in financial aid processing (staffing levels, workload measurements, financial support to processing activities, etc.)
- —campus and systemwide policy statements related to financial aid administration
- —flow process chart for financial aid check production
- —other available procedural documentation which relates to financial aid processing

Opinion Polls

See following sample student questionnaire developed by review personnel at the Davis campus of the University of California.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATION

Questionnaire

Please use the enclosed card for your answers, using any soft leaded pencil.

About Yourself

1) Sex: A = Male B = Female

2) Marital Status: A = Single B = Married C = Separated/Divorced

3) Class in School: A = Freshman B = Sophomore C = Junior
D = Senior E = Grad/Prof.

4) Living location: A = On-Campus B = Off-Campus

5) Are you a transfer student: A = Yes B = No

6) How did you first hear about the availability of Financial Aid?
A = High School/Community College Counselor B = Admissions Material
C = Parents/Friends/Students D = Financial Aid Office
E = UCD Catalogue N = Other

7) Have you read any of the Financial Aid Office literature describing available programs?

A = No B = Yes, but it was not very helpful
C = Yes, and it was somewhat helpful D = Yes, and it was very helpful

8) For how many quarters have you received financial assistance from the Financial Aid Office?

A = 3 or less B = 4 to 6 C = 7 to 9 D = 10 to 12
E = More than 12

9) During the current academic year, how often after aid award have you had personal contact in the Financial Aid Office?

A = None B = Once a year C = Once a quarter
D = 2-3 times a quarter E = 4 or more per quarter

10) What was your major reason for going to the Financial Aid Office?

A = Advice on money management
B = Reporting a change in personal income
C = Request for Short-Term/Emergency Loan
D = Potential overaward (too much aid in view of resources)
E = Inquiries about your own award N = General Information

11) Have you received any financial counseling from the Financial Aid Office?

A = Yes B = No

12) If yes, was it helpful to you?

A = Very much so B = Somewhat C = Not at all

13) In your opinion, was the needs analysis you received from the Financial Aid Office fair?

A = Yes B = Somewhat C = No

14) Was the award you received adequate?

A = Yes B = Somewhat C = No

15) Where would you first go for help with a financial problem?

A = Parents/Friends B = Student Employment Center
C = Financial Aid Office D = Bank or other private institution
E = Academic department or School/College
N = Other campus Administrator (i.e., Chancellor, Dean of Women, etc.)

16) Which of the activities described below would appear to be the most important to the Financial Aid Office?

A = Serving student needs
B = Compliance with Administrative guidelines and procedures

17) How easy was it for you to see a Financial Aid counselor?

A = Very easy B = Fairly easy C = Some waiting
D = Difficult

18) How helpful has the Financial Aid Office been to you in dealing with your financial problems?

A = Extremely helpful B = Helpful but they could have done more
C = Somewhat helpful but could have done a lot more
D = No help at all

19) Was the Financial Aid Office staff courteous to you?

A = Yes B = Somewhat C = No

20) Have you ever requested additional aid after receipt of your initial award?

A = Yes, and granted B = Yes, and rejected C = No

21) How would you describe the requirement for supporting documentation in your application for additional aid?

A = Excessive B = Reasonable N = Not applicable

22) How do you feel about the amount of paper work required for application and continuation of financial aid?

A = Excessive in all areas B = Reasonable in all areas
C = Excessive in some areas D = Reasonable in some areas

"END OF DOCUMENT"